

345099

JPRS-EPS-84-133

29 October 1984

19990322 046

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

4
92
A05

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

29 October 1984

EAST EUROPE REPORT

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Bulgarian Leaders Thank Romanians for Cable (SCINTEIA, 11 Oct 84)	1
SFRY, Polish Views on Self-Management Aired (BORBA, 5 Oct 84)	2
Briefs	
Bloc Faith in Poland	4
GDR National Day Marked	4
GDR Film Gala in Bucharest	5

ALBANIA

Mihali Reads Hoxha's Message to 11th Brigade (ATA, 14 Oct 84)	6
Jurist Writes on 'Equality of Citizens Before Law' (ATA, 18 Oct 84)	8
Briefs	
Railroad to SFRY Border	10

BULGARIA

Zhivkov Meets Israel CP's Me'ir Wilner (RABOTNICHESKO DELO, 12 Oct 84)	11
Legal Status of Foreign Visitors Explained (BTA, 18 Oct 84)	13
Defense Minister Order on Air Force Day (Dobri Dzhurov; NARODNA ARMIYA, 16 Oct 84)	15

Dzhurov, Mitkov at Garrison Celebration (Ivan Genov; NARODNA ARMIYA, 13 Oct 84)	17
Dzhurov, Semerdzhiev, Mitkov at Army Celebration (Petyo Dafinkchiev; NARODNA ARMIYA, 13 Oct 84)	18
Briefs	
Zhivkov Congratulates Conductor Naydenov	19
Zhivkov Letter to Writer	19
CSSR's Strougal Awarded	19
ILO Director to Dyulgerov	20
Bozhinov Departs for Budapest	20
OIRT Delegates to Mikhaylov	20
Bozhinov Returns From Budapest	20
FAO Session Ends	20
Yemeni Socialist Party Group	20
Swiss Labor Party Congratulated	21
Bulgarian-Argentine Consultations	21
DPRK Embassy Reception	21
Parliamentarians Depart for Latin America	21
Petko Yordanov Dies	21
Antanosov Receives CSSR Visitors	22
Zarev Receives CPCZ Delegation	22
GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	
Wooring Religious Peace Movement, Plea for Cooperation (W. Kliem; DEUTSCHE ZEITSCHRIFT FUER PHILOSOPHIE, No 8, 9, Sep 84)	23
POLAND	
Briefs	
Nawrocki on Freedom of Expression	33
Minister Decrees Windows Washed	33
ROMANIA	
'Political Pluralism' Under Socialism Hailed (Ovidiu Trasnea; ERA SOCIALISTA, No 16, 20 Aug 84)	34
Roundtable on State, Public Property (Ioan Ceterchi et al.; ERA SOCIALISTA, No 16, 20 Aug 84)	45
Briefs	
Soviet Ties	70
UNESCO Education Session Opens	70
Greek Peace Movement Delegation	70
Zhao Enlai Exhibition	70
Women's Council Plenum	71
Romanian-Soviet Youth Meeting	71

Israel's Peres Thanks Dascalescu	71
YUGOSLAVIA	
Pozderac Interview on Unity, Responsibility (Hamdija Pozderac Interview; BORBA, 13-14 Oct 84)	72
Markovic Addresses Cooperation Anniversary Meeting (BORBA, 11 Oct 84)	78
Serbian SAWP Committee Discusses Ecumenism (TANJUG, 16 Oct 84)	80
Daily Critically Reviews USSR Journal Article (POLITIKA, 11 Oct 84)	82
Briefs	
Albania's Charges	86
Bulgarian Army's Anniversary Celebration	86
KNJIZEVNE NOVINE Editor	86
Serb Official Dies	87
TANJUG-TT Cooperation	87
New President of Macedonian TV	87

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

BULGARIAN LEADERS THANK ROMANIANS FOR CABLE

AU151908 Bucharest SCINTEIA in Romanian 11 Oct 84 p 5

[Text] To Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, RCP Secretary General and President of the Socialist Republic of Romania,

Comrade Constantin Dascalescu, Prime Minister of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania,

Dear Comrades,

Please receive our most cordial thanks--on behalf of the BCP Central Committee, the State Council and Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, and all the Bulgarian people--for the warm congratulations extended to us on the 40th anniversary of the victory of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria.

We fully share your assessment that the comprehensive relations between the BCP and RCP and between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Socialist Republic of Romania are continuously expanding and deepening and that our countries make a contribution to diminishing international tension, promoting disarmament, and safeguarding and strengthening peace.

We are convinced that these traditional ties of close friendship and cooperation will expand and develop, to the benefit of our two peoples and of the unity of the socialist community, and in the interest of the cause of peace and socialism throughout the world.

We wish you ever greater success in building the comprehensively developed socialist society and meeting the 13th RCP Congress with new achievements, for the further flourishing of neighboring Socialist Romania.

Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

Grisha Filipov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

CSO: 2700/18

SFRY, POLISH VIEWS ON SELF-MANAGEMENT AIRED

AU121059 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 5 Oct 84 p 5

[Excerpts] Cavtat, 4 Oct (TANJUG)--A 2-day discussion of self-management by Yugoslav and Polish theoreticians concluded in Cavtat yesterday. Its aim was to see to what extent self-management is seen in the two countries as an inseparable part of the struggle for socialism. It was the first case in the Yugoslav practice where the discussion of this subject was organized on a bilateral basis, with the participation of theoreticians of two countries only. The initiative for the gathering was made, and the round-table conference organized by the editorial boards of the journals SOCIJALIZAM and NOVE DROGI, the theoretical journals of the LC and the PZPR.

The exchange of opinion showed that deep differences exist in how self-management is seen and accepted in the two countries, but it also confirmed that the Polish theoreticians believe that self-management is a basic element of building any socialism.

The Yugoslav participants at the gathering--Stipe Suvar, Mijat Sukovic, Najdan Pasic, Dusan Bilandzic, Radoslav Ratkovic, Zivojin Rakocovic, Radovan Radonjic, and Milos Nikolic--believe that socialism must proceed beyond the state, and that socialist self-management is a step onward from state socialism, a step that leads to the historical aim that the power and the rule on behalf of the class be transformed into direct management and the power of the class itself. The Yugoslav view is that socialism is above all a process of the emancipation of labor, and not a change in the forms of ownership.

The Polish participants in the discussion--Stanislav Wronski, Jozef Barecki, Czeslaw Bobrowski, Stefan Opara, Sylwester Szafarz, and Kazimierz Doktor--believe that in the countries that are building socialism, the dispute about the roads in its building boil down to a dispute about democracy. According to them, there are two alternatives in this context. The one is: either the state of self-management; and the other: either direct democracy or representative democracy.

In the course of the past 40 years of building socialism, Poland has passed through several stages of crisis, but it emerged from each of them with a higher form of democracy. Even now, at this stage of the deepest crisis,

it sees the way out through democratization, but Poland cannot say that the majority of the workers class is in favor of self-management and economic reform, although the Polish party sees the strategic direction of the development of socialism in an institutionalized linking of the two ideas.

Poland sees self-management in a close linking with the state, which is to say as a certain form of a prolonged arm of the state which it wants to strengthen, not for the purpose, as the Polish theoreticians say, of enhancing in this way centralism and bureaucracy which hamper democratization, but in order to weaken these obstacles.

Among a number of rejoinders which were heard during this exchange of opinions, the following was noticed: The Yugoslav participants believe that self-management cannot be regarded as a necessary evil or a lever which is pulled when society is to be pulled from a crisis.

CSO: 2800/42

BRIEFS

BLOC FAITH IN POLAND--[Excerpt from a statement made by Professor Doctor Wieslaw Skrzydlo, first secretary of the PZPR Provincial Committee in Lublin at a meeting with Lublin University students as reported in SZTANDAR LUDU, Lublin, 31 August-2 September 1984] [Question] After August 1980, were we faced with a crisis of confidence in our party and government on the part of the socialist countries? [Answer] It is not surprising that the leaders of the countries allied with ours were viewing what was going on in Poland with concern. We felt the impact of this concern here in Lublin Voivodship (...) when our wide-ranging foreign exchange programs were sharply cut back, even though they were never broken off completely. Now, starting in 1983, we are getting back to where we were 4 years ago. As far as the level of trust in us now is concerned, it goes without saying that, for example, official policies on the Church or private agriculture are being evaluated from a different perspective and a different background of historical experience. You even run into criticism in this regard. But on a practical level our allies agree with and accept these policies in the understanding that we know best how to solve our own problems. [Text] [Warsaw POLITYKA in Polish No 37, 15 Sep 84 p 2]

GDR NATIONAL DAY MARKED--On the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the foundation of the GDR, Dr Siegfried Bock, the ambassador of that country in Bucharest, held a press conference on Thursday, which was attended by representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the central press, AGERPRES, of Romanian Radio and Television, party activists, and foreign media reporters. Recalling the historical significance of the event being celebrated, the GDR ambassador highlighted the great achievements of the workers class together with the peasantry and intelligentsia, under the leadership of the SED, in the 35 years of socialist construction of the country, the successes attained in establishing a modern economy, the achievements attained in developing agriculture, scientific and technical research, and in improving the material and cultural well-being of the working people. Referring to the good relations established between our parties and peoples, the speaker highlighted the decisive importance of the meetings between Comrades Erich Honecker, and Nicolae Ceausescu for the continuous developing and deepening of cooperation and collaboration in many fields between our parties and countries for the benefit of our peoples, the cause of peace and socialism, and cooperation and understanding throughout the world. [Text] [Bucharest SCINTEIA in Romanian 28 Sep 84 p 5 AU]

GDR FILM GALA IN BUCHAREST--Bucharest 2 Oct (AGERPRES)--A film gala was arranged in Bucharest on Tuesday to mark the 35th anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic Republic. The show was attended by Ilie Verdet, member of the Executive Political Committee, secretary of the RCP Central Committee, Suzana Gadea, chairman of the Council of Socialist Culture and Education, Tamara Dobrin, executive chairman of the National Council of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front, other Romanian officials and a large public. [Text] [Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1800 GMT 2 Oct 84 AU]

CSO: 2020/12a

MIHALI READS HOXHA'S MESSAGE TO 11TH BRIGADE

AU141829 Tirana ATA in English 1730 GMT 14 Oct 84

[Text] Tirana, 14 Oct (ATA)--The people of Fier District celebrated today two important events: the 40th anniversary of the formation of the 11th shock brigade and the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the city from the foreign occupiers and traitors to the country.

Homage was paid and wreaths were laid at the martyrs graves of the district on behalf of the Central Committee of the party, the party committee and the executive committee of the district people's council, the former partisans of the 11th shock brigade, etc.

A grand popular rally was organised in the main square of the city on the occasion. Attending were also the member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the party and first secretary of the district party committee, Pali Miska and other comrades.

Amidst the enthusiasm of those present, the alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the party and vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers Qirjako Mihali read out the greeting the beloved leader of the party and people, Comrade Enver Hoxha sent to the former partisans and cadres of the 11th shock brigade on occasion of the 40th anniversary of its formation.

Forty years ago, right after the liberation of Fier, the 11th shock brigade was formed, the greeting says among the other things. The 3d group of Mallakastra, which made up the nucleus of this brigade, had traversed a glorious militant road being a source of supplying with partisans the new brigades of our heroic national liberation army that had been created and were being created at that time.

You, former partisans and cadres of the effectives of this unit, came in its creation trained and with a rich military experience, you had accumulated before in the numerous and bloody clashes against the Nazi fascist enemies and the traitorous gangs in Mallakastra and other regions of the country, such as in Vlora, Tepelena, Skrapar, Myzeqe, etc., right after its creation, your brigade, together with other big units of our national liberation army, was charged with very important tasks, to take part in the fighting for the liberation of the capital. Through very difficult weather conditions and the floods of Myzeqe, it smashed the enemy that tried to come to the assistance of the Nazi garrison besieged by the partisan forces in Tirana and defended our western coast.

Following the liberation of the country, the greeting says further on, the 11th shock brigade, continued its struggle against the enemy element and the reactionary forces to purge a series of regions of northern Albania, reaching up to the Maja of Hekurave. In very difficult winter conditions, the partisans of this brigade passed through the whole region of Dukagjin and other nearby areas, for which the reaction trumpeted that the partisans could not lay in foot [as received] there. In this struggle the brigade enjoyed the aid and support of the valiant people of our highlands, whose sons and daughters increased its ranks. The 11th shock brigade honorably carried out the military-political task charged by the party and the general staff of the national liberation army.

Today and constantly the party and our entire people recall and will recall with profound respect the martyrs of the 11th shock brigade.

The struggle of our people who filled the ranks of the partisan brigades with their sons and daughters, under the correct and farsighted leadership of the party, brought about the great day of the liberation, 29 November 1944, the 40th anniversary of which we will magnificently celebrate this year. All the victories attained in these four decades have been achieved due to this struggle and the blood shed by the best sons and daughters of our people. Therefore, we will always carry the victories forward, to make the life of our working people happier and Albania strong and unconquerable by any enemy, internal or external, the greeting says in conclusion.

The message of greetings was received with applause and stormy acclamations for the party and Comrade Enver Hoxha.

Then Comrade Qirjako Mihali greeted those present on behalf of the Central Committee of the party, the Council of Ministers, the General Council of the Democratic Front of Albania and Comrade Enver Hoxha personally. He spoke among the other things about the great patriotic tradition of the people of this district, the road full of struggles traversed by the 11th shock brigade, etc. He pointed out the magnificent successes attained in our country over these 40 years of liberation under the leadership of the party, with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head, in all the fields of life.

His speech was often punctuated by the enthusiastic applause and acclamations of those present for the party and Comrade Enver Hoxha.

CSO: 2020/10

JURIST WRITES ON 'EQUALITY OF CITIZENS BEFORE LAW'

AU181306 Tirana ATA in English 0930 GMT 18 Oct 84

[Text] Tirana, 18 Oct (ATA)--The Constitution of the PSR of Albania expressively sanctions the equality of citizens, Comrade Aranit Cela, chairman of the high court, writes in the newspaper ZERI I POPULLIT. This is expressed in the first place in the fact that the people are free from every kind of oppression and exploitation and enjoy the effective rights to work and be paid equally. Albania is the sole country in the world where the proportion between high salaries and the low ones is 1:2. It is also reflected in the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, in the process of the rapprochement of the work of the cooperativists with that of the workers, of the rapprochement of the two forms of socialist property, etc. All the citizens, with no distinction, enjoy the superiorities of our socialist order in the field of education and free curing, in guaranteeing life while being ill and in senility, etc.

The citizens in our country, the newspaper ZERI I POPULLIT continues, enjoy really the great right to have their say in solving the social and state problems, to take part in running the country, to elect and to be elected. There is no restriction of privilege in our country concerning the rights and duties of the citizens because of social position.

A significant (?fact) to this, is besides others, the equality of national minorities with all the other citizens, fruit of the correct national policy that has been and is being pursued consistently by the PLA and it is fully sanctioned in the Constitution of the PSR of Albania and which is fully applied in life. Article No 42 of the Constitution says: Protection and development of their peoples culture and traditions, the use of their mother tongue and teaching of it in school, equal development in all fields of social life are guaranteed for national minorities.

Any national privilege and inequality and any action that violates the rights of national minorities is contrary to the constitution and is punishable by law.

For the national minorities, just as for the Albanian people ZERI I POPULLIT stresses further on, the time of anti-people's regimes when they were deprived of the most elementary rights passed once and for all, never to turn back. Only in the years of the brilliant epoch of the party, the national minorities were granted effectively all the democratic rights and freedoms. So conditions have been created to ensure that all these rights be carried into reality. For the minorities schools of different categories in the mother tongue have been opened [word indistinct].

One finds cadres from national minorities in the supreme organs of the party and power, Tirana University and other scientific, cultural institutions, etc.

The effective equality of citizens in our country, the article concludes, proves completed Comrade Enver Hoxha's saying that only in Socialist Albania can it be spoken of a real democracy, proclaimed not only in words, but guaranteed in reality.

CSO: 2020/10

ALBANIA

BRIEFS

RAILROAD TO SFRY BORDER--Tirana, 12 Oct (ATA)--In its latest issue the newspaper ZERI I RINISE carries a photo-reportage with aspects from the work of the voluntary brigades for the construction of Shkoder-Hani I Hotit [on border with SFRY] railway line. In the sector Aliaj, the last one in this railway, the newspaper writes among others, the work has been concentrated mainly in laying the rails in the last meters of the track and in setting the inner lines of the international railway station of Bajza. Characteristic of the work in these last days was a great mobilisation to carry out successfully all the set tasks. Now, the youth brigades of the districts of Tepelenja, Pogradec, Diber and Fier are working there. [Excerpt] [Tirana ATA in English 0915 GMT 12 Oct 84]

CSO: 2020/10

BULGARIA

ZHIVKOV MEETS ISRAEL CP'S ME'IR WILNER

AU152032 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 12 Oct 84 pp 1, 8

[Report on Todor Zhivkov statement at meeting held on 11 October in Sofia with Me'ir Wilner, general secretary of the Israeli Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee met Me'ir Wilner, general secretary of the Israeli Communist Party.

At the meeting, which proceeded in a cordial and comradely atmosphere, the two party leaders exchanged information on the tasks which the BCP and the Israeli Communist Party are coping with at the present moment. They also discussed some topical international problems and questions of the worldwide communist and workers movement.

The comrades Todor Zhivkov and Me'ir Wilner pointed out the great importance of the Soviet Union's peaceloving initiatives and of those adopted by the other socialist community member-countries aimed at stopping the arms race at a time when the international situation continues to be aggravated because of the striving of ruling U.S. circles for military superiority. The two leaders stressed that under the circumstances of this complicated international situation which makes mankind face the brink of a devastating nuclear conflict, the question of rallying all democratic and peaceloving forces in the struggle to bring the aggressive intentions of imperialism to failure, the question of preventing the militarization of outer space, and of implementing a turn toward a dialogue on an equal basis instead of facing confrontation, as well as of promoting mutually advantageous cooperation, is assuming particular significance.

In exchanging opinions about the situation in the Middle East it was stressed that the aggressive and adventurous policy conducted by the governments of the United States and Israel within the framework of their "strategic alliance," the Camp David agreements, and the Reagan plan were the chief reason for the explosive situation existing in that area. The goal of this policy is to clear the path toward the establishment of the full domination of imperialism in the Middle East, to the detriment of the interests of the peoples living in this area.

The two party leaders confirmed their conviction that a lasting peace in the Middle East can be achieved through a comprehensive and just settlement of the situation, not through behind-the-scene intrigues and separatist deals. In this connection, the two leaders expressed their support for the Soviet proposals of 29 July 1984 which are determining the basic principles as well as the mechanism of settling the conflict--namely to convene an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all interested sides--including the PLO--the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine.

Comrade Todor Zhivkov expressed his solidarity and the solidarity of the Bulgarian communists with the consistent work of the Israeli Communist Party in its efforts to rally the progressive forces within the country in the struggle for peace, for the defense of the vital interests of the working people, for democracy and equal rights.

Comrade Me'ir Wilner expressed his high appreciation for the Bulgarian people's successes, under the leadership of the BCP, in building a developed socialist society and for the constructive contribution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to consolidating peace and security in the world.

The comrades Todor Zhivkov and Me'ir Wilner remarked with satisfaction on the successful development of relations between the BCP and the Israeli Communist Party. They confirmed the resolve of the two parties to continue to work also in the future for their further consolidation and expansion on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, for the sake of the joint struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism, to the benefit of peoples in both countries.

Dimitur Stanishev, secretary of the BCP Central Committee, attended the meeting.

CSO: 2200/9

BULGARIA

LEGAL STATUS OF FOREIGN VISITORS EXPLAINED

AU181415 Sofia BTA in English 0820 GMT 18 Oct 84

[Text] Sofia, 18 Oct (BTA)--In its latest issue, the SOFIA NEWS weekly, foreign languages publication of the SOFIA PRESS AGENCY carries an interview with Mr Vasil Dahterov, chief legal adviser at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on the legal status of foreign citizens under Bulgarian law.

More than 6 million foreign citizens annually enter Bulgaria and stay for long or short periods in this country. In 1972 the National Assembly passed a special act which settled the legal status of foreign citizens, regardless of the reason for which they are visiting Bulgaria.

When entering Bulgaria the foreigners hold a valid passport or another document for travel abroad and an entry or transit visa. In the case of transit through the country the foreigners must have a visa for the next country along his route. A transit visa entitles its holder to a stay of up to 30 hours, a term which may be extended at the passport office in the respective district. When driving through on his own vehicle the foreigner must have a permit for it.

"Generally speaking, Bulgaria has kept the visa-free arrangements with many countries but certain changes were needed owing to adverse developments in the international climate", Mr Vasil Dahterov pointed out. Now the entry visas may no longer be automatically extended. Visas are still not required for groups of more than 5 people and for families with one or more children.

The foreigner on a private visit, in addition to an entry visa must have a certified invitation from the Bulgarian citizen whose guest he is going to be to the effect that his host will provide for him or her during the stay.

Cases when certain persons are denied entry into Bulgaria are rare and involve persons having committed actions which have endangered the security and the interests of the Bulgarian state or who enter with intention to commit a crime.

Asked whether there are differences in the rights enjoyed by foreigners and those by Bulgarian citizens the chief legal adviser of the Ministry of Foreign

Affairs of Bulgaria answered that the laws of our country rule out any discrimination. Under conditions of reciprocity, the rights and obligations can be extended or restricted if there are respective agreements with the origin country of the foreigner.

During a visit the foreigner has the right to move anywhere in the country and on visits to the border regions should observe the rules applicable to Bulgarian citizens. If traveling in a motor vehicle, the foreigner must spend the nights only at the designated places for motorists, at hotels and camp sites.

When a stay continues for more than 3 months it is considered prolonged or permanent. After a long permanent residence the foreigners are granted an exit visa after they submit the same documents as are required when Bulgarian citizens are leaving this country to live abroad. They may not leave the country only if they are under judicial investigation, if they are serving a sentence, owe fines or have other monetary obligations towards the state. They may leave the country if they submit guarantees that they will fulfill their obligations.

When asked whether the right of the foreign citizens to stay in Bulgaria may be rescinded before its term expires Mr Vasil Dahterov answered: This may only be done by the interior minister in cases when the country's security or interests are infringed or its prestige eroded or when a crime has been committed. Expulsion can also be applied. The procedure involved in compulsory measures allows the right of appeal and guarantees the foreigners rights, including that of legal defence,

CSO: 2200/12

DEFENSE MINISTER ORDER ON AIR FORCE DAY

AU171214 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 16 Oct 84 pp 1, 2

["Order of the Day" issued by Army General Dobri Dzhurov, minister of national defense, on the occasion of 16 October--of the Bulgarian Air Force and anti-aircraft defense]

[Text] Comrade soldiers, cadets, sergeants, and petty officers!

Comrades officers and generals!

Comrades pilots, navigating officers, engineers, and technicians!

Comrades specialists, workers, and military employees within the system of the Air Force!

Comrades veterans of our aviation!

Today, the working people in our socialist motherland and its worthy soldiers are solemnly celebrating Air Force Day.

On this festive day we celebrate every year the great achievements of our native aviation, the successes of our pilots and navigators, engineers, technicians, and specialists, as well as of all Air Force employees, and all those who are vigilantly watching over our native Bulgarian skies, so that they may be clear forever.

The 40th anniversary of our glorious socialist Air Force is celebrated by the Bulgarian people and by the soldiers of the Bulgarian People's Army in an atmosphere of nationwide political and labor enthusiasm, with active efforts for the further implementation of the decision adopted by the 12th BCP Congress and the National BCP Conference.

The Air Force of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is the successor of the glorious militant and revolutionary tradition of our people, who for over 12 centuries have defended their freedom and independence with manly courage.

As an offspring of the BCP our native aviation has crossed a glorious path illuminated by heroism and self-sacrifice in the battles of the Fatherland War fighting together, side by side, with the remarkable Soviet pilots.

In the postwar period, throughout the years of the country's socialist upsurge, as a result of the close attention and care devoted to our Air Force by the BCP Central Committee and by Comrade Todor Zhivkov, personally, thanks to the selfless and fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union, our Air Force developed and asserted itself as a reliable protector of the air space of our socialist motherland.

A new generation of pilots are growing up and being trained in the ranks of our military Air Force, they are conquering supersonic speed, and proudly, side by side with their Soviet brothers, they are training to become pioneers of space.

Under the conditions of the present-day, exceptionally important and tense international situation, created as a result of the aggressive imperialist circles activities, and, above all, thanks to the United States, the pilots of the Air Force, together with the soldiers of the Bulgarian People's Army, and together with the armies of the fraternal socialist countries that are members of the Warsaw Pact, under the leadership of the invincible Soviet Army, are ready to fulfill their patriotic and international duties in defending the achievements of socialism.

Comrades soldiers, commanders, political workers, pilots, engineers, and aviation specialists!

I congratulate you most sincerely on this great holiday--the Bulgarian Air Force Day!

I wish you further successes in your struggle to improve the quality, fighting capacity, and combat readiness of our Air Force, and in the comprehensive mastering and efficient use of the new technical equipment of the Air Force as well as in consolidating discipline and strict observance of all rules within the Armed Forces.

Long live our beloved socialist motherland--the People's Republic of Bulgaria!

Glory to the BCP--the organizer and source of inspiration of all our victories!

Long live the heroic Bulgarian people and their worthy Air Force troops!

Signed: Army General Dzhurov, minister of national defense

CSO: 2200/12

BULGARIA

DZHUROV, MITKOV AT GARRISON CELEBRATION

AU152156 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 13 Oct 84 pp 1, 3

[First Lieutenant Ivan Genov's report: "Generous Reward for Worthy Work"]

[Excerpts] Can one day represent everything that the soldiers have created throughout the whole year? The day on which the soldiers of the detachment of Officer Stoyanov received the recognition of their worthy deeds and selfless work during the year, and on which they received the proud title "excellent unit" was as beautiful as a golden fruit in the fall.

Army General Dobri Dzhurov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense, Lieutenant General Mitko Mitkov, head of the Main Political Administration of the Bulgarian People's Army, generals and officers, and representatives of the okrug and city leadership attended the ceremony. Colonel General Vladimir Yakushin, representative of the commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member-states at the Bulgarian People's Army, also attended the celebration.

Afterwards, Army Gen Dobri Dzhurov greeted the soldiers and the commanders. He stressed that during the past year the socialist competition in the Bulgarian People's Army has made qualitative progress, and the number of units in which soldiers who have excelled in shooting and other areas, as well as class specialists are serving has increased.

Dwelling on the exceptionally complex and tense international situation, the minister of national defense stressed that during the new study year also the party requirements for high quality and effectiveness will dominate the everyday life of the soldiers. This requires excellent organization of every study hour and every exercise. In conclusion, Army Gen Dobri Dzhurov warmly and cordially wished the soldiers good health and vigor and even greater successes in their valiant work in defending the socialist homeland.

CSO: 2200/9

BULGARIA

DZHUROV, SEMERDZHIEV, MITKOV AT ARMY CELEBRATION

AU152118 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 13 Oct 84 pp 1, 3

[Report by Captain Petyo Dafinkchiev: "Moving Celebration"]

[Excerpts] Yesterday, Army General Dobri Dzhurov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense; Colonel General Atanas Semerdzhiev, first deputy minister of national defense and commander of the General Staff of the Bulgarian People's Army; Lieutenant Mitko Mitkov, head of the Main Political Administration of the Bulgarian People's Army; representatives of the party and administrative leadership of the okrug; and generals and officers of the Bulgarian People's Army visited the soldiers of the garrison in which Officer Tabakov is serving.

Colonel General Vladimir Yakushin, representative of the commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member-states at the Bulgarian People's Army, also attended the celebration.

In his speech, Army Gen Dobri Dzhurov expressed his conviction that the garrison will further produce soldiers who are boundlessly loyal to the party and the people, excellent specialists in the military profession, and worthy defenders of the motherland. He also expressed his belief that they will multiply the ranks of the soldiers who have excelled in combat and political training, and class specialists, who have mastered the military equipment and weapons to perfection. The minister of national defense wished the administrators of the new region to utilize all possibilities provided by the region, in order to create a united soldiers' collective in which the sense of responsibility and the comradely assistance are above everything else. He urged the soldiers to remember that the motherland needs worthy defenders.

CSO: 2200/9

BRIEFS

ZHIVKOV CONGRATULATES CONDUCTOR NAYDENOV--Sofia, 11 Oct (BTA)--Tonight the Sofia musical circles festively celebrated the 85th birthday anniversary of conductor Asen Naydenov, the doyen of the Sofia opera house with the staging of the opera "Boris Gudonov" by Mussorgsky. A decree of the State Council for awarding the hero of the jubilee with the highest Bulgarian order of "Georgi Dimitrov" was read. In a congratulatory letter to Asen Naydenov, Mr Todor Zhivkov points to his great achievements in the art of conducting, to his active and fruitful creative work and to his merits in developing the Sofia Opera House. The letter points to the considerable contribution of the conductor in developing contemporary Bulgarian socialist culture and to his great international prestige which raised Bulgaria's prestige in the sphere of music abroad. [Excerpt] [Sofia BTA in English 1935 GMT 11 Oct 84 AU]

ZHIVKOV LETTER TO WRITER--Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian on 16 October on pages 1 and 2 carries a 700-word report by Tsveta Ivanova, BTA correspondent, on a festive meeting held on 15 October at Sofia's "Ivan Vazov" national theater, to mark the 70th birthday of writer Kamen Kalchev. The meeting was attended by several Bulgarian officials, including the following: Milko Balev, BCP Central Committee Politburo member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and chairman of the State Council, and others. Milko Balev read the text of a 350-word letter from Todor Zhivkov to writer Kalchev, congratulating him on the title "Hero of Socialist Labor" awarded to him on the occasion. Zhivkov's letter emphasizes the writer's contribution to socialist literature in Bulgaria, by pointing out that Kalchev "had grown up and was educated in the ranks of the BCP, asserting himself as a writer and citizen in the struggle for the party's bright ideals and for their triumph." Zhivkov's letter also stresses that the creative work of the writer "is strongly linked to the heroic past and socialist present of Bulgaria, to the fate and constructive labor of the workers class--it is work permeated by the emotions and concern of the writer-communist for the great problems of our social and intellectual development." The letter closes by wishing Kalchev "long life" and "further great successes" in his creative achievements. [Editorial Report]

CSSR'S STROUGAL AWARDED--The State Council has issued a decree on awarding Comrade Lubomir Strougal for the second time with the Georgi Dimitrov Order on his great contribution to developing and strengthening friendship and cooperation between the BDP and the CZCP, and between Bulgaria and the CSSR,

and on his 60th birthday. Comrade Todor Zhivkov and Grisha Filipov have sent Comrade Lubomir Strougal a message with most cordial and fraternal greetings and wishes. [Excerpt] [Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1830 GMT 18 Oct 84 AU]

ILO DIRECTOR TO DYULGEROV--Petur Dyulgerov, chairman of the Bulgarian Trade Unions Central Council, yesterday received Francis Blanchard, director general of ILO. Issues of mutual interest were discussed. Special attention was devoted to Bulgaria's participation in ILO. [Text] [Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 3 Oct 84 p 8 AU]

BOZHINOV DEPARTS FOR BUDAPEST--Todor Bozhinov, member of the BCP Central Committee deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of energy and raw material resources, left for Budapest yesterday to attend the 18th session of the CEMA committee for cooperation in material-technical supply. He was seen off at Sofia airport by Mariy Ivanov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs, and high-ranking officials of the Ministry of Energy and Raw Material Resources. Istvan Kiss, Hungarian ambassador to Bulgaria, was also Present. [Text] [Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 4 Oct 84 p 6 AU]

OIRT DELEGATES TO MIKHAYLOV--Stoyan Mikhaylov, secretary of the BCP Central Committee, received the leaders of the delegations participating in the 25th jubilee session of the OIRT [International Organization for Radio and Television] Program's Commission. The guests were acquainted with the basic tasks facing the BCP and all Bulgarians in fulfilling the programs of the 12th BCP Congress and of the National Party Conference on issues of quality. The responsible role of radio in propagating the experience and achievements of real socialism and in further intensifying the cooperation among the socialist countries was also emphasized. [Text] [Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 4 Oct 84 p 6 AU]

BOZHINOV RETURNS FROM BUDAPEST--Comrade Todor Bozhinov has returned home from Budapest where he attended the 18th session of the CEMA Committee for Material and Technological Supplies. [Text] [Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1600 GMT 6 Oct 84 AU]

FAO SESSION ENDS--Sofia, 5 Oct (BTA)--With the adoption of a final report, the second session of the FAO Working Group on Women's and Peasant Families' Participation in Farming, ended here today. The conference was attended by delegations from 19 countries--members of the group, observers from four countries--members of the United Nations, which are also members of the group and also representatives of government and non-government international organizations. [Excerpt] [Sofia BTA in English 1334 GMT 5 Oct 84 AU]

YEMENI SOCIALIST PARTY GROUP--On 15 October Comrade Georgi Atanasov met the working group of the Yemeni Socialist Party, which is visiting Bulgaria. The guests were briefed on BCP activity in successfully implementing the decisions adopted by the 12th BCP Congress and the National Party Conference on constructing the developed socialist society in Bulgaria. [Text] [Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 2030 GMT 15 Oct 84 AU]

SWISS LABOR PARTY CONGRATULATED--The BCP Central Committee has sent the following telegram to the Central Committee of the Swiss Labor Party: Dear Comrades, On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Swiss Labor Party, we convey to you the most cordial, fraternal congratulations and wishes on behalf of the BCP Central Committee, communists, and all working people of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The Bulgarian communists highly appreciate your activities for protecting the political, economic, and social rights of the Swiss working people, and support your struggle for the defense of the vital interests of the workers class, as well as your indefatigable efforts for the cohesion of all progressive forces serving the democratic innovation of Swiss society, as well as for peace and socialism. On the occasion of your glorious anniversary, we once more express our confidence that the relations between the BCP and the Swiss Labor Party will develop in the future also in the interest of our common communist ideals, for the sake of the unity of the communist and workers movement, for the sake of the friendship existing between the Bulgarian and Swiss peoples. [Text] [Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 14 Oct 84 p 1]

BULGARIAN-ARGENTINE CONSULTATIONS--Buenos Aires, 15 Oct (BTA)--From October 10 through 13 consultations were held between the ministries of foreign affairs of Bulgaria and Argentina. The Bulgarian delegation was headed by Mrs Maria Zakharieva, deputy minister of foreign affairs, and the Argentine by Mrs Elza Kelly, the first deputy minister of foreign affairs. Bilateral relations were discussed. They are developing successfully and in the interests of the two countries. Measures were outlined for their further expansion in the political, the economic and the cultural sphere. [Excerpt] [Sofia BTA in English 1238 GMT 15 Oct 84 AU]

DPRK EMBASSY RECEPTION--On the occasion of the 39th anniversary of the foundation of the Korean Workers Party, Ha Ton-yun, DPRK ambassador to Bulgaria, gave a cocktail reception at the embassy last night. A documentary Korean film was shown on the official, friendly visit paid in June 1984 by a party and state delegation from the DPRK, under the leadership of Comrade Kim Il-sung, general secretary of the Korean Workers Party Central Committee and DPRK president. The reception, which proceeded in a friendly atmosphere, was attended by deputy chairmen of the National Assembly, deputy ministers, high-ranking functionaries of the BCP Central Committee apparatus, and by leaders of sociopolitical and mass organizations. [Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 10 Oct 84 p 8 AU]

PARLIAMENTARIANS DEPART FOR LATIN AMERICA--Sofia, 13 Oct (BTA)--A Bulgarian parliamentary delegation led by Mr Mitko Grigorov, vice president of the State Council, left on an official visit to Mexico, Argentina and Venezuela at the invitation of the parliaments of these countries. [Text] [Sofia BTA in English 1840 GMT 13 Oct 84 AU]

PETKO YORDANOV DIES--Petko Rusev Yordanov, member of the BCP Central Committee, active fighter against fascism and capitalism, eminent journalist, party and public creator and editor in chief of long standing of the journal PARTIEN ZHIVOT [PARTY LIFE] died on 11 October after a long illness. [Excerpt] [Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1830 GMT 12 Oct 84 AU]

ANTANOSOV RECEIVES CSSR VISITORS--Comrade Georgi Atanasov has received Frantisek Stafa, mayor of Prague, and Alos Olsan, secretary of the Prague City CPCZ Committee. Atanasov acquainted the guests with the topical tasks facing the Bulgarian working people in fulfilling the decisions of the 12th Party Congress and of the National Party Conference. The development of fraternal ties between the cities was positively assessed, and a readiness for further expanding the comprehensive cooperation between Sofia and Prague was expressed. [Text] [Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1830 GMT 10 Oct 84 AU]

ZAREV RECEIVES CPCZ DELEGATION--Comrade Kiril Zarev, secretary of the BCP Central Committee, has received the working group of the CPCZ Central Committee, has received the working group of the CPCZ Central Committee led by Jiri Poslt, deputy director of the industrial department at the CPCZ Central Committee, which is visiting Bulgaria. Comrade Kiril Zarev briefed the Czechoslovak Party workers on some basic issues of the socioeconomic development of Bulgaria in fulfillment of the decisions of the 12th BCP Congress and of the National Party Conference on quality of production. Views on further expanding and deepening Bulgarian-Czechoslovak cooperation in the economic and scientific-technological sphere were also exchanged, [Text] [Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 2030 GMT 11 Oct 84 AU]

CSO: 2200/12

WOONG RELIGIOUS PEACE MOVEMENT, PLEA FOR COOPERATION

East Berlin DEUTSCHE ZEITSCHRIFT FUER PHILOSOPHIE in German vol 32 No 8/9
Sep 84 pp 767-775

[Article by Prof. W. Kliem, Institute for Marxist-Leninist Philosophy, Academy for Social Sciences under SED CC: "Communists and Christians Together in the Struggle for Peace"]

[Text] In his speech at the 7th Central Committee session, Erich Honecker described as the forces, decisive also for the future, that can keep humanity from sliding into nuclear war: our socialist community with its main force, the USSR, the nonaligned states, the millions and millions of people in the western world opposing the confrontation policy and the U.S. drive for world domination, and their acting together in the peace struggle.¹ Due to the importance of the cooperation among the various peace forces, a separate section is devoted to this topic in the material which is substantively preparing the Sixth Philosophy Congress of the GDR, entitled "Socialism and Peace--Humanism in the Struggles of Our Time. Standpoints--Experiences--Problems."² Tracing the drift of ideas in it, I should like to present some reflections on today's quality and dimension in the peace commitment by religious forces and, specifically, on the spiritual foundations for the cooperation between communists and Christian peace forces.

Among the many millions of people who are opposing the arms buildup and confrontation course of the most aggressive imperialist circles are also, and not to a mean extent, the faithful of various denominations, religious peace forces of various type besides, and Christian churches among them. By their commitment to preventing nuclear war and to stopping and limiting the arms race and to disarmament, the religious peace forces are making a significant and indispensable contribution to the safeguarding of peace. Its significance is underscored by that most people in the world today adhere to a religion and religions and their institutions enjoy a high moral authority in public international life. Especially since the Brussels NATO missile resolution the commitment by religious peace forces has spread at unprecedented quality and dimension. A model expression of it was the world conference, "Religious Representatives for Rescuing the Sacred Gift of Life from a Nuclear Catastrophe," held in Moscow in 1982. At that conference, 590 top representatives of the Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Moslem, Shinto, Sikh and Zoroastrian religions from 90 countries in the world got together to express, on behalf of hundreds of millions of believers from around the world their worry about a nuclear catastrophe. They

emphatically called for ending the arms race, especially for banning the nuclear weapons. With total determination they opposed "the new dangerous doctrines of 'limited nuclear war' and the manufacture of especially anti-humane weapons such as the neutron bomb, aimed at materializing these dangerous doctrines."³ On the crucial point they recorded in unanimity that "nuclear war can under no circumstances ever be justified and presents the greatest danger to humanity."⁴ They rejected the theses that nuclear war is feasible and winnable and demanded a halt of the arms race by freezing nuclear armaments and conducting negotiations leading to decisive steps toward their limitation and reduction and a definite abolition of the existing arsenals in nuclear and radiological weapons in order finally to achieve general and total disarmament. Those religious representatives expressed their intention to aid the politicians in their peace efforts and make their own active contribution to the peace struggle.

The development of the peace commitment by religious forces in the Christian denominations has been especially impressive. That is no coincidence because those creeds, after all, are spread prominently through the territories of the leading NATO states, being thus the most influential creeds in those states from which the nuclear peril emanates or the populations of which are most affected by that peril through the NATO missile resolution and its implementation. Especially the peace commitment of Christian churches reached a new level there--whatever their particular differences might be. Never before have they issued so many and such copious declarations of principle on war and peace as in the last 4 years. Of outstanding importance to the Catholic domain was the Pastoral Letter of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in the United States on War and Peace, of May 1983. In it, the bishops opposed the unbridled nuclear arms buildup course of the Reagan administration and called for resistance against such a policy. They announced unmistakably that all that mattered today was the avoiding of war: "As a people we must refuse declaring the idea of nuclear war legitimate." They demanded of NATO a renunciation of the doctrine of a first use of nuclear weapons and affirmed this: "There must be clear public resistance against the talk about a 'winnable' nuclear war or against unrealistic expectations of 'surviving' a nuclear exchange and against strategies for a 'protracted nuclear war.' We oppose all such talk."⁵ The "Declaration on Peace and Justice" from the sixth plenum of the Ecumenical Council of Churches in 1983, at Vancouver, represented the non-Catholic domain--the Protestant, Orthodox and Anglican churches. It says among other things: "We appeal to the churches, mainly those in (East and West) Europe and North America, to double their efforts in convincing their governments of reaching agreement by way of negotiations, turning away now, before it is too late, from the plans to deploy additional or new nuclear weapons in Europe, and starting at once to reduce and then completely dismantle the nuclear armed forces that now exist."⁶

The activities by the religious peace forces are highly prized by the Marxist-Leninist parties and the governments in socialist states. Reflecting the attitude of principle the communists maintain on the peace commitment by religious forces today was the reception that Erich Honecker, chairman of the GDR State Council, gave the representatives of the Central Commission of the Ecumenical Council of Churches when it convened in Dresden in 1981. There Erich Honecker paid tribute to the central commission pronouncements against the deployment of new nuclear weapons systems in Western Europe and for immediate disarmament talks.

He affirmed that those demands conformed with GDR policy and that on their enforcement depended not only peace in Europe but, by and large, the fate of all nations. He made the point that the preservation of peace was the first priority in GDR policy and the broadest efforts on behalf of this matter by all people, regardless of their ideological or religious ties, was the order of the day. Great importance attached there to the voice and activities of the churches.⁷ In that sense the SED also appreciated the pastoral letter of the Catholic bishops in the United States on war and peace as a constructive contribution to safeguarding peace. And only recently Konstantin Chernenko proclaimed the solidarity between communists and Catholics in the peace struggle.⁸

The readiness of communists to work together with the faithful in the various religious circles who are sincerely interested in the preservation of peace has been one of the maxims of Marxist-Leninist policy, and not only since the international situation has recently been exacerbated. The readiness for cooperation and the cooperation itself have had a long and fruitful tradition. In the line of this tradition are found, along with the cooperation thus far in the peace struggle, the joint struggle for democracy and social progress and, above all, the cooperation between communists and believers achieved and tested in the antifascist resistance struggle, in concentration camps and penitentiaries, in the Free Germany National Committee, and during emigration. The policy of cooperating with the faithful, aimed at jointly settling vital questions, is a basic political principle for the communist and workers parties. It is an inseparable component of the Marxist-Leninist alliance policy.⁹

New in it today is that this cooperation has transcended all previous boundaries and achieved an unprecedented breadth. Particularly in religious circles it has turned out to be a historic fact of greatest consequence that despite diverse, even opposing, ideological positions agreement is possible on basic political issues. Sharing the interest in preventing nuclear catastrophe, communists and Christians come together today mainly through their common political insights into the requirements for securing peace. Such shared political insights are the most important spiritual basis for their collaboration.

The new quality and dimension in which religious forces are exercising their responsibility for peace have created prerequisites for broadening and deepening the collaboration for solving the peace question the like of which never existed before. That is impressively documented by the demands and positions of the various religious circles referred to above. Some new features in the peace commitment by Christian forces that have become effective in this sense may be singled out in general terms:

1. First it has been widely realized that there is no reasonable alternative to the peaceful coexistence between states with differing social orders. The activities by Christian peace forces today are notably marked by their distance from the anticommunist crusade policy and ideology of the most aggressive imperialist circles or by their opposition against them. By way of contrast, one may recall in this context that in the 1950's, in the period of Cold War against socialism, there were more than a few circles of clergy that sought to justify in "Christian" terms the use of atomic weapons against real socialism. Due to the prevalence of a militant clerical anticommunism in many churches at that time,

reactionary forces were able to manipulate even ecumenical bodies, commit them to the basic policy line of the imperialist powers, and virtually eliminate them as a peace force. The attempt by Reagan and his clerical apologists¹⁰ at reviving such a clerical-anticommunist crusade ideology in service to the nuclear arms buildup now runs into determined resistance from broad Christian circles, including also the churches in the United States (National Conference of Catholic Bishops and other ecclesiastic bodies such as the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States¹¹). That broad Christian circles today reject anticommunism as a guideline for foreign policy action, or even oppose it, does not mean, however, that anticommunist reservations have generally been overcome. The proponents of the clerical-anticommunist crusade ideology keep putting their stakes on its effect as they used to do. By mobilizing anticommunist reservations they mainly seek to split the peace movement, prevent a common cause among all peace forces, drive a wedge between the peace movement and real socialism and finally reverse the very concern of the peace movement, particularly of the Christian peace forces. Theologian Walter Kreck has aptly called anti-communism and anti-Sovietism a "sort of new Hallstein Doctrine" for the peace movement.¹² In view of the massive attempts at reviving the clerical variant of the imperialist crusade ideology and using clerical anticommunism to split the peace movement and, especially, to manipulate the Christian peace forces, taking issue with clerical anticommunism remains of great importance in our philosophic efforts, even gains greater importance.

Generally speaking, the Christian forces committed to the peace issue even today are, by and large, differentiated in terms of whether and how much they let themselves be guided by basic anticommunist positions, especially by the anticommunist lie about the threat and the demagogic slogan of a "peace in freedom" that is derived from it, or recognize the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with differing social orders as the basis for political action and thus break away from the imperialist war ideology.

2. A Christian peace commitment furthermore is today marked by its seeking to overcome its isolation from the peace struggle of other public forces. It does in general not see itself as a "Christian" peace movement apart and with special "Christian" goals, even if such goals also may be intended and are likely to be so intended in the churches, but as a part of the all-inclusive peace movement. Religious peace forces of Christian denominations today are often integrated from the outset within the non-religious political peace movement and often appear as its coiniciators or cosponsors. In their programs they do not address only believers but all people of good will and are willing to work together with them. It is particularly significant that Christian peace forces are willing to collaborate with communists--granted that there is a degree of differentiation.

3. Irrespective of its religious motivation and certain religious intentions, the peace commitment by Christian forces is based spiritually on political insights today and generally human postulates of ethics, and is deliberately posited that way so as to make possible the collaboration with non-religious peace forces and those in other religions. Christian peace forces, in general, are willing to collaborate with other peace forces on the basis of minimal agreement on ethical and political matters. Their decisive ethical demand lies in the recognition of human life as the supreme value in the real world. Their decisive political demand lies in preventing the nuclear threat against human life by outlawing nuclear

war and any means that might bring it about, especially the arms race and the nuclear strategies. Among the Christian peace forces the recognition and use of the data of the "secular sciences" have come to prevail widely, too. They do not generally make the claim to have a better, a "Christian" understanding of the concrete problems in safeguarding peace. Without abandoning their specifically Christian view that the peace problem is ultimately a problem of the "sinful world" that could in the final analysis be coped with only through man's "return" to God or by God, Christian peace forces focus on a business-like commitment that wants to take into account the political and military conditions for securing peace.

4. Finally, and not last, it is worth noting that the Christian peace forces integrate the problems of war and peace into a broader political, social, economic and intellectual-cultural context, including additional global problems such as the developmental problems of the Third World and the preservation of the conditions for the natural existence of mankind. Creating a peaceful world is largely seen in connection with moving toward a "just world," the views on "justice" being rather diverse, for all that. There is much of a consensus on rejecting the political suppression and economic exploitation of the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa and on condemning the U.S. interventionist policy in those regions. Christian peace forces, among other things, champion a just world economic order and oppose colonialism and racism, they advocate doing away with exploitation, suppression, illiteracy, poverty, starvation and malnutrition and favor the use of science and technology to enrich human life and dealing with the natural resources of the earth that opposes all waste and ensures a decent life also for future generations.

Nor are the peace forces of the 1980's a homogeneous whole. Not only are they socially heterogeneous, they are also highly differentiated politically and ideologically. Ideologically they show to a considerable extent the specific traits of bourgeois peace conceptions. This broad differentiation implies that the positions and demands listed in the previous paragraph are represented unevenly in manner and importance and that their ways and means quite often differ. A neutralist conception of peace is widespread. It comes from the idea of being able to take a position above or between the opposing social systems and to act as a "third force" reconciling, balancing, peace-promoting. Regardless of all the differentiations and contradictions, Christian peace forces today represent an important branch or current of humanistic thinking and searching. In the decisive field of the international conflict between the forces of humanism and antihumanism the commitment by Christian peace forces indicates in a special way that, on the basis of the social processes that determine our era, a shift is taking place in the relation between two opposed traditional lines in the history of Christianity--one humanistic and democratic and the other one antihumanistic and antidemocratic--in favor of the humanistic or democratic line. The basic alliance policy position of Marxism-Leninism for which V. I. Lenin found the classical formulation, in relation to religious believers, is gaining more and more decisive weight. Paraphrased, there applies to the collaboration with believers and religious circles for solving any concrete historic tasks, which means securing the peace at present: "The unity in this truly revolutionary struggle by the suppressed class for a paradise on earth is more important to us than a unanimity among the proletarians about a paradise in heaven."¹³

To the revolutionary workers movement, the undeniable and indissoluble ideological contradictions between religious faith and the scientific materialistic world outlook are, in principle, of secondary importance compared with common vital interests and political goals--and that is nothing recent. In understanding the nature of religion, the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism resolutely opposed those anarchistic conceptions in the workers movement that wanted to proclaim the struggle against religion a political task of the workers party.¹⁴ Today's communist movement carries on that tradition. In line with the insights of the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism, and in contrast to bourgeois materialism and atheism, the revolutionary workers movement conducts no "struggle" against religion as if it caused all the evil in the world. It still rejects that sectarian notion that would identify religion with political reaction. However critical its relationship with religion is, a conflict with religion is not part of the communist movement's political program. Nor is atheism the most important in Marxism-Leninism, much though atheism unavoidably also belongs to it, but rather the explanation of the historic mission of the workers class, which today includes more than ever the securing of world peace.¹⁵

In the spirit of genuine tolerance, communists respect religious faith and the exercise of it. They do not impose the scientific materialistic world outlook on religious believers. Nor do they make its acceptance a precondition for cooperation. That implies the conviction that religious faith commits no one to seclusion or antisocialism and that it is not in any way antagonized by a religiously motivated peace commitment. It cannot be ignored that there are religious circles that are claiming that and certain imperialist demagogues and clerical-anticommunist forces never stop abusing religious faith as an anticommunist mobilization ideology. Marxism-Leninism has always proceeded from the assumption that a sense of responsibility motivated by religious convictions can produce an honest, ethical conduct and active humanism, for which communists always have had respect and which forms an important basis for cooperation. And that is most impressively demonstrated precisely by the current peace commitment of religious forces.

It may be pointed out at this stage that along with shared political insights a consent on ethical conceptions can also form an important spiritual foundation for cooperation. As a concrete action guideline for personal living and social commitment, religion has traditionally asserted itself as ethics. Many of its values and norms are abstract and ambiguous in their formulation, can be understood in terms of the "hereafter" or in terms of living in the world, in terms of individual or social ethics. Peace as a value can be interpreted as an expectation of the hereafter or as an action guideline for an effective peace commitment, but also in the sense of a Pax Americana. The term of "love" can be used to hide antagonistic class contradictions but also as an appeal for active solidarity among and with all the exploited and oppressed. As the history of mankind demonstrates, a religiously motivated ethics can assume a variety of contents and serve various social forces as spiritual orientation or justification. A historic example of outstanding significance are Martin Luther's humanistic views on social ethics. They attest to a profound solidarity with the people and still deserve our high regard. In his speech at the constituent meeting of the GDR Martin Luther Committee, Erich Honecker made a special point of Luther's encouraging a creative, meaningful activity. It had "become a basic source of inspiration for the common projects of Christians and non-Christians alike in the construction of socialism in our society which has eradicated the exploitation of man by man."¹⁶

Generally speaking: Wherever an ecclesiastic or theological ethics is oriented to ideas of humanistic values or has absorbed humanistic traditions, it adds another significant spiritual basis for cooperation. That pertains particularly to the peace issue in which ethical problems play a surpassing role in the Christian peace forces. At the Moscow world conference of religious representatives, to mention one example, the peace ethics was the salient spiritual point of departure of general consensus. The appeal from this world conference to the governments in the world says: "The questions of nuclear war and the production of nuclear weapons are not merely political questions, they mainly constitute a moral problem."¹⁷ Also the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in the United States in its Pastoral Letter and other Christian churches have developed a humanism that is oriented to peace ethics.

At the SED Central Committee social science conference, Kurt Hager posed the task "to conduct still more extensively the struggle against those currents in the bourgeois ideology that are backing the military U.S. and NATO course and become much more familiar with the views of those forces that are advocating a policy of reason and peaceful coexistence."¹⁸ As to the religious forces, it is worth reiterating the need to intensify the confrontation with the U.S. and NATO drift toward war and with the clerical anticommunism that is backing it up ideologically. On the other hand, especially for working with Christian peace forces, it shows how important it is to get to know their views. As communists we cannot pass up the fact, for instance, that for furnishing the resistance against the arms buildup and confrontation course of the Reagan administration and the ruling NATO circles with an ethical foundation, influential Christian forces have reinterpreted the traditional church "doctrine for a just war." In the past primarily used by ruling exploiter classes as a moral justification for war and used in that sense as well--a haunting memory still is how that doctrine in the 1950's shored up the clerical atomic bomb philosophy, and still today that doctrine does its traditional job for the proponents of Reagan's crusade policy--today it is widely used, especially by churches in their exercising their peace commitment, as a legitimate Christian peace ethics. That is done directly or indirectly. Indirectly, in that the validity of the church doctrine on a just war is strictly rejected for a war conducted with atomic and other mass destruction weapons, while the rejection itself is still based on the criteria in that doctrine.¹⁹ Directly, in that the criteria in that doctrine are considered valid and, through a consistent application of these criteria, the NATO war drift with its atomic strategies is opposed.²⁰

Two major theoretical aspects have recently become prominent when the church doctrine of a just war is used as a peace ethics:

For one thing, the doctrine of a just war is used to reject in a more accentuated fashion than previously war as a means for settling international conflicts and to outlaw totally warfare with means of mass destruction, especially atomic weapons. To establish that standpoint, they are mainly drawing on the criterion of the "commensurability of means." It says that in a war the ratio of inescapable victims must be commensurate to the success sought. The sacrifice, especially in human lives, must not be bigger than the "disputed right or good." Noncombatants must be spared, a "war of annihilation" is to be precluded. Unless those terms are met, a war is "unjust," i.e. morally unjustified, and must not be conducted. Proceeding from those conditions, Christian peace forces are now

demonstrating that atomic war would under any conditions be a "war of annihilation," a war that unavoidably would destroy what the proponents of the nuclear arms buildup purportedly want to "defend." They arrive at the conclusion that there could be no value, no good and no right by which the destruction of mankind could be justified. These arguments resolutely oppose the imperialist crusade ideology that is propagating the chance of "mutual destruction" on behalf of "supreme values."

Secondly, the doctrine on a just war is used to chart an ethical orientation for a course that leads to an effective nuclear arms limitation, an end of the arms race and, eventually, to disarmament. Here the emphasis in using this doctrine has shifted more to preventing wars under the conditions of forcible nuclear armament. Its range of application was "advanced," as it were, into the sphere of securing peace. Thus the doctrine on a "just war" became a doctrine on a "just peace." By means of that interpretation, Christian peace forces are asking whether there is a "just reason" for "deterrence" by atomic weapons and whether the "deterrence system" is a "just peace" or not rather a "prewar status." Their conclusion is that one must not be allowed even to threaten the use of weapons, a use which is ethically proscribed. As atomic war could not be "just" under any conditions, a "just deterrence" by atomic weapons was equally indefensible and no suitable means for safeguarding peace. Christians and churches should oppose nuclear war as much as nuclear strategies (e.g. the "first strike" or "limited nuclear war"). For many Christian peace forces that kind of argument became the spiritual basis for their resistance to the deployment of new nuclear weapons in Western Europe.

Through further inferences from the conditions of the doctrine on a just war Christian peace forces, including the American Catholic bishops in the pastoral letter referred to, have come up with a number of ideas on how to shape an international order of peace, a "just peace." The basic positions taken there--ending the policy of force and confrontation, banning war as a means for settling international conflicts, an end to interference in the internal affairs of other states, respect for national independence and sovereignty, establishing good neighborly relations and cooperation, mutual recognition of legitimate rights and interests and so forth--conform with the political demands and ethical maxims of the revolutionary workers movement on war and peace in our time as well as with the positions the nonaligned states have taken in this matter. They match particularly the basic demands in the political program of the Warsaw Pact states for securing peace and establishing a just order of peace.²¹ Marxism-Leninism, as one knows, takes a critical position on the church doctrine on a just war; this mainly because it leaves out of consideration the crucial objective criterion for assessing the character of a war, its class character, in that it becomes the continuation of the politics of certain classes by means of organized armed struggle. In their struggle for peace, communists will always expose, first and foremost, the socioeconomic class-bound roots of armament and war and resolutely reveal the designs of the most aggressive imperialist circles. They are unmasking the demagoguery of the imperialist ideologues who seek to hide the causes of the arms buildup and nuclear threat, and they are pointing out realistic ways for solving the peace problem. Yet communists do not claim to be the only ones who are for peace. Without reservation they are advocating a broad alliance of all adherents to peace and a common cause, including the Christians and all religious circles that feel committed to peace. Also the peace-ethics interpretation of the church doctrine on a just war can form a spiritual basis for cooperating with them in the sense of a "coalition of reason."

Communists see in Christians fellow combatants for a humane world without war, exploitation and oppression. Relying on a joint interest in creating such a world and on a mutual respect for different basic ideological positions, communists are working on further reinforcing the historically grown identical interests in active humanism. The threat of nuclear catastrophe turns that into an unprecedented and compelling need.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cf. E. Honecker, "In kampferfuellter Zeit setzen wir den bewaehrten Kurs des X. Parteitages fuer Frieden und Sozialismus erfolgreich fort" [In These Times of Struggle We Press Ahead Along the Road to Peace and Socialism Chartered by the 10th Party Congress], Berlin, 1983, pp 5 f.
2. Cf. DEUTSCHE ZEITSCHRIFT FUER PHILOSOPHIE, No 5, 1984, p 403.
3. Cf. DIE ZEICHEN DER ZEIT, No 10, 1982, p 257.
4. Ibid., p 253.
5. Cf. "Hirtenworte zu Krieg und Frieden" [Pastoral Words on War and Peace], Cologne, 1983, pp 194, 198.
6. Cf. LUTHERISCHE MONATSHEFTE, Hannover, No 10, 1983, p 470.
7. Cf. NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 29/30 August 1981.
8. Cf. "U.S. Catholic Bishops Condemn Washington's Arms Buildup," NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 10 January 1983; E. Honecker, "Mit Tatkraft und Zuversicht die vor uns liegenden Aufgaben zum Wohl des Volkes meistern" [Coping, with Energy and Confidence, with the Tasks Ahead for the Good of the People], Berlin, 1982, p 13; "USSR Confirms the Will to Negotiate. Konstantin Chernenko Answers Catholics," BERLINER ZEITUNG, 31 March/1 April, 1984.
9. Cf. "Buendnispolitik im Sozialismus" [Alliance Policy in Socialism], Berlin, 1981, especially pp 9-21, 249-257.
10. Among these clerical apologists or role models are, especially, circles of a religiously dressed up "New Right" in the United States such as the "Moral Majority" movement that was initiated by Jerry Falwell. Like Reagan, Falwell proclaims that the United States was chosen to "make God's will prevail all over the world." Communism he defines as the incarnation of the devil and war against the USSR, as God's will. U.S. military superiority would bring redemption from all evil. Falwell also took part in drafting Reagan's election platform. (Cf. G. Basler, "'New Right' Mobilizes Conservative Potential in the United States," IPW-BERICHT, No 12, 1981, pp 46 ff; and L. Ireland-Kunze, "The Hallelujah Lobby," DIE WELTBUEHNE, No 6, 1982).
11. Cf. G. Hall, "Swimming Against the Current. On Some Political Trends in U.S. Imperialism," PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, No 9, 1983, especially pp 1161 f.
12. Cf. UNSERE ZEIT, 14 July 1982.

13. V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and Religion," "Werke" [Works], Vol 10, Berlin, 1958, p 74.
14. Cf. V. I. Lenin, "On the Relation Between the Workers Party and Religion," "Werke," Vol 15, Berlin, 1962, pp 405 f.
15. Cf. "Theses by the SED Central Committee for the Karl Marx Year 1983," Berlin, 1982, p 27.
16. E. Honecker, "Our Times Call for Commitment to Progress, Reason and Humanity," "Martin Luther und unsere Zeit. Konstituierung des Martin-Luther-Komitees der DDR" [Martin Luther and Our Age--Constituent Meeting of the GDR Martin Luther Committee], Berlin, 1980, p 15.
17. Cf. DIE ZEICHEN DER ZEIT, loc. cit., p 257.
18. K. Hager, "Gesetzmaessigkeiten unserer Epoche--Triebkraefte und Werte des Sozialismus" [Inevitabilities of Our Era--Driving Forces and Values of Socialism], Berlin, 1983, p 17.
19. So in the declaration from the Moderamen (management body) of the Reformed League in the FRG, "The Allegiance to Jesus and the Peace Responsibility of the Church," where the atomic arms buildup is condemned directly from the point of view of the Gospels and any atomic strategy is rejected that means to justify nuclear armament and make nuclear war "feasible" ("first strike" and "limited nuclear war" strategies).
20. Among them the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in the United States, in the Pastoral Letter cited above.
21. Cf. "Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact States, Prague, 5 January 1983," NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 7 January 1983.

5885

CSO: 2300/27

BRIEFS

NAWROCKI ON FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION--[Excerpt from essay by Witold Nawrocki, director of the PZPR Central Committee Culture Department, as published in ARGUMENTY, Warsaw, 10 June 1984] There is no room on our cultural scene for Orwellian accusations directed against socialism or our social and political system. There is no room for the exploitation of history in order to advance the manipulative programs designed to inflame nationalistic and anti-Soviet moods. There is no room for political slander or socially destructive activity. But there is room for art, for cultural activities that reflect different philosophical motivations and different artistic orientations, different moral, social, and philosophical trends, but without violating certain axiomatic truths of an institutional, social and political nature (the primacy of working class interests and the leading role of the party) and an international nature (respect for our allies) and without transgressing the limits of freedom of expression with a view to promoting anarchy in our social life, sterile nihilism, and destruction. So, these positive proposals and their realization in practice are the thresholds which cannot be crossed by the assaults on Polish culture launched by the false ideologies of the antisocialist forces as they seek to transform culture not into an arena of human mutual understanding, but rather into yet another battlefield. [Text] [Warsaw POLITYKA in Polish No 37, 15 Sep 84 p 2]

MINISTER DECREES WINDOWS WASHED--[Excerpt from interview with Prof Dr Wiktor Boniecki, Economics Academy in Krakow, with Jan Frenkl as published in ECHO DNIA, Krakow, 21 August 1984] Every so often the press, radio and TV carry statements by government ministers, directors of firms, and presidents of this or that in which they talk about a "package" of problems. They start out their interviews by saying that "on this point" things are good or things are bad or that recently certain parties are "getting ready" to do various things. The madame minister of domestic trade recently issued two executive orders. The first one was about the washing of shop display windows. The second one was about keeping the premises clean in stores. In order to make sure that these orders are carried out high-ranking officials are supposed to attend to these matters, and they will be spending time on this over the next few weeks. What do the directors of retail trade enterprises and store managers think about this? Will they go on "getting ready" to do things? But it is the minister who is supposed to govern, while these directors are supposed to be running their businesses. Right now it is the other way around. And it really is ridiculous and sad that a government minister would be issuing orders for windows to be washed. [Text] [Warsaw POLITYKA in Polish No 36, 8 Sep 84 p 2]

'POLITICAL PLURALISM' UNDER SOCIALISM HAILED

Bucharest ERA SOCIALISTA in Romanian No 16, 20 Aug 84 pp 14-18

[Article by Ovidiu Trasnea: "The Socialist Political System Is the People's Chief Revolutionary Gain."]

[Text] Nicolae Ceausescu said, "In all activities and by the efficient operation of the unique democratic system, let us demonstrate in action the superiority of socialist democracy, the democracy wherein the people have become masters of their fate and are purposefully building their own free and independent future!"

Socialism has brought to historical development a new kind of political system that is revolutionizing the very concept of the political. It is primarily a matter of a change in the content of the main categories of the political as well as an essential change in the principles of organization and exercise of political power, so that the socialist revolution is proving to be a process of radical and comprehensive changes in all areas of society and all subsystems of the social system. The change in political affairs is especially significant and important because the very role of the political has been considerably changed. It is a matter of planned construction instead of the chance appearance of some structures within others as in the previous revolutions, a historically unprecedented manifestation of the active role of the political factor in the anticipation of a new world and also in the organization and management of the masses in order to bring it about. Therefore the formation of a political system capable of implementing the tasks of socialist construction and revolution, furthering the revolutionary process, and ultimately securing the transition to communism is a main requirement of the socialist revolution and its achievement is unquestionably the people's historic gain.

As we know the characteristics of a political system depend in every stage of its existence upon the nature of the entire social system (the social order), the economic system, and the social structure and also upon the stage of their development, which lends the political system particular purposes and functions and accordingly makes certain demands concerning its components and mechanisms. In addition to these controlling factors of course there are other particular factors of a historical-national nature that affect the particular form of the

political system, which is always deeply rooted in every nation's native genius, as well as the directions of its development.

Accordingly it may be said that the creation of the socialist political system reflects the dialectical unity of the general and the particular, being specifically expressed in each country in addition to some general characteristics. The present characteristics of the political system established in Romania for the last 40 years are due to a historical process of radical structural changes that involved the entire society. It may be said that in the 40 years since the historic act of the Antifascist and Anti-imperialist Revolution for Social and National Liberation on 23 August 1944 and especially since the Ninth Party Congress Romanian society has undergone radical structural changes of an economic, social, political and cultural nature under Nicolae Ceausescu's wise leadership. Those revolutionary qualitative changes were the foundation upon which the new socialist political system was built.

Fundamental Social-Political Changes

To be sure in this revolutionary process the political system was not isolated from the changes in the other subsystems of the social system, since it was unquestionably affected by the demands of those changes, but neither did it register or incorporate them passively, since it functioned as the chief collective agent of the social-political reform and also, through its leader, the RCP, as the author of the revolutionary theoretical plan whereby the respective structural changes were accomplished. It is very important from the theoretical-methodological standpoint to emphasize this because some contemporary scientific treatments of political systems and their evolution often show two contradictory but equally one-sided trends: One exaggerates the autonomy (actually relative) of the political system in an attempt to explain its structure and especially its evolution solely by internal, endogenous factors, while another makes of it an almost passive receptacle of environmental influences, suggesting a quasi-mechanical, imitative adaptation of the political system to the latter.

As we know any political system with social classes contains two main types of relations, those of domination and those of management or government. The formation and development of the socialist political system made fundamental changes in the very nature of those relations because it changed the nature of the political power. In the Marxist view, domination is characteristic of societies based on private ownership of the production means and on relations of oppression and exploitation, which are the main source of political domination. Through the intermediary of the state as a "pure" form of political power, the economically dominant class becomes politically dominant as well, while political relations take the form of domination, subordination and sanction of social injustice.

Abolition of private ownership of the means of production as well as generalization and further consolidation of socialist relations in the economy and society as a whole led to corresponding radical changes in the basic social structure and to formation of the new classes of workers, producers, owners and beneficiaries of the social wealth, which are friendly classes because of their vital interests and ideology in common and enjoy relations of alliance, collaboration and social-political unity. Thanks to that fundamental change, basic to the real social equality of all Romanian citizens, the political power has lost its

dominant character and political relations among the classes are no longer antagonistic or aggressive. Working class leadership, Romanian society's most advanced social force, is not exercised as any political or class domination but as a "hegemony cleansed of coercion," according to Gramsci's well-known expression.

Since the political relations also take the form of management relations, however, the correlation between domination and government is very important to the new kind of power. To be sure, as Friedrich Engels said, division between the governing and the governed, the leaders and the led, was a natural outcome of the division of labor and a technical fact indispensable to social organization, but it is a division between social groups in the antagonistic societies. Since government is exercised in the interest of the holders of power, the relations between the governing and the governed, between the leaders and the led, are and appear as relations of opposition. Therefore, categorically speaking, power does not coincide with authority.

Of course in a sense this technical fact of division between the leaders and the led seems to characterize all types of societies. But in the regular view supported by the Marxist conception in general and the RCP Program in particular we must distinguish the effort to do away with this division by raising all the masses to the level of the leading political force. Moreover, even within socialist society essential changes are taking place in the relations between the leaders and the masses. It is primarily a matter of eliminating the traditional clash between the governing and the governed by eliminating the clash of group and class interests between the leaders and the masses, while on the principle of the people's sovereign, full and sole power this division is being attenuated by constantly enhanced methods of involving the workers more and more extensively and effectively in the actual management of public affairs. Actually this means qualitative modification of those relations.

It was with the greatest clarity and scientific precision that Party Secretary General Nicolae Ceausescu substantiated the inauguration of this new kind of political power, inevitably corroborated by the developmental trends of the present period. As he pointed out, "Now that the nations of the world are increasingly involved in the effort to build a truly free existence according to their own will and aspirations, it is clearer than ever that it is only by taking power into their own hands that the people can achieve their self-determination and a real democracy and establish the true humanism."

This new kind of political power continually enhances and matures its truly democratic qualities and institutes a new kind of legitimacy in the form of the people's authentic sovereignty, which is being gradually perfected and is leading to the identification of power with authority. Political power (the force that comes from the heart of society and is placed above it but becomes more and more alienated from it because of its class character, as Friedrich Engels said about its origin) is now becoming the workers' power under socialism and it is under their control. Furthermore the continuing socialization of political power is to be seen throughout the development of the Romanian political system, as a process implementing the trend of political progress, a trend that can be pursued on several levels. Of course the most important and basic one is that of socialization of the chief resources of this power, namely the economic ones or rather the production means. It is this new capacity of the workers as

owners, producers and beneficiaries that enables them to exercise political power in an institutional structure of a size, qualities and functions unprecedented in the previous systems.

On the institutional level, the power is socialized in two ways, by gradual extension of the power system until it incorporates all social categories and the entire population, and by close integration of all its components in society.

Socialization of political aims is also a typical process, making the interests of the masses as a whole predominant in strategic political decisions and thereby promoting the revolutionary socialist humanism of the new political power.

In the light of historical development and accordingly as an immediate reality as well, the socialist political system established in Romania is one that generates a new kind of democracy formed in a dialectical synthesis of the development of democratic government.

An Unprecedented Kind of Democracy

The interpretation of democracy as it is viewed by the RCP and its secretary general is of great theoretical importance. As Nicolae Ceausescu pointed out, "Socialist democracy means active participation of all members of society in management of state and public affairs and in public life, as well as every individual's complete fulfillment in society." This masterly definition brings out both the immediate significance, namely the act of participation in making and implementing decisions on individual, group and national-community interests as an expression and manifestation of the principle of the people's sovereignty, and the long-range historical significance of democracy, wherein participation does not figure as an end in itself or even as a means of exercising power but primarily as a school of self-management and an essential means to free development of the individual's creative powers and to harmonious, all-around development of his personality, in the sense that participation in itself means and brings about an intensive and extensive socialization of the individual.

A most vital question is raised by this historical significance of the Romanian socialist political system because it coincides with the establishment of a new system of all-around democracy surpassing by dialectical negation both the historical gains and the inevitable limitations of bourgeois political democracy, thus indicating that no real participation and consequently no complete democracy is possible except under the conditions of socialist society. The reality and universal quality of the people's democratic participation in exercise of power and management of public affairs depend upon certain socioeconomic and political-legal conditions and those of personality development that only socialism can provide in its general development. Even non-Marxist authors realize that in the socialist societies, as contrasted with the capitalist ones, "Mobilization and development are comprehensive in scope, including changes in the economic and institutional systems and in the personality." (David Lane, "The Socialist Industrial State," London, 1976, p 13)

Real social and national equality is the first prerequisite. Freedom from any discrimination, the main source of that equality, lies in suppression of private ownership of the production means, complete elimination of exploitation and

oppression, accelerated development of the productive forces and their harmonious distribution throughout the country, and generalization of socialist social and production relations in keeping with the values of socialist ethics and justice.

The Romanian socialist system is superior not only because it has done away with the sources of social inequality among individuals and social groups, but also because it offers all members of society equal opportunities for expression in the social field and in all creative material and cultural activities. As the creation of the new order in Romania strikingly attests, socialism assures all citizens fully equal rights regardless of nationality, race or sex and creates the material, economic, political and social conditions for strengthened friendship and brotherhood between the Romanian people and the national minorities and for active collaboration in working for the further prosperity of the common fatherland, socialist Romania.

Of course any real, effective and general participation also requires a certain amount of civic education and instruction, a certain body of knowledge, and a certain level of socialist awareness as well, especially of its political, civic and ethical components. The radical revolution that took place in the field of culture and social awareness as an integral part of construction of the new order led to an extensive development and improvement of education on all levels, to an unprecedented development of science and culture, and to promotion of the system of political, civic and ethical values peculiar to socialism and its complete assimilation in the social and individual awareness. It is significant in this respect that the RCP Program points out that the progress of the Romanian political system and the development of socialist democracy require further improvement of the workers training, competence, body of knowledge and ideological and political levels.

The reality and universal nature of active and effective participation also depend upon the existence and enforcement of a system of civil rights and freedoms. As Nicolae Ceausescu said, "The RCP expects socialism to be the society of the broadest democratic rights and freedoms of the masses of workers, the society of full application of the people's collective energy and wisdom, and the society of unlimited opportunities for all-around development of the personality."

Actually, as the renewed agitation under the cloak of contemporary neoconservatism also indicates, the liberal slogan "equality of opportunity" is doomed to remain a formal declaration as long as the citizen is abandoned in the sea of socioeconomic inequalities. In the RCP's view and practice, strict enforcement of socialist legality and political-legal protection of the civil rights and freedoms are accomplished with the material, socioeconomic guarantee of those rights and freedoms. It is significant that the qualitative character and superiority of socialism is predicated, for the first time in history, in the close correlation between society's socioeconomic and cultural development, on the one hand, and the extent and effectiveness of its civil rights and freedoms on the other. The party secretary general pointed out this correlation as a regular feature of the Romanian system in the report presented in the draft Constitution in 1965: "The nation's further progress, consolidation and development of the economic base of society, science and culture, and improvement of the entire people's material and cultural living standard consolidate and extend the workers' rights and freedoms and secure the development of socialist democracy."

Formation of the institutional and organizational structure that can not only facilitate but also stimulate an increasingly broad and effective participation has played an important part in making use of the superiority of socialist democracy and making the workers' and the entire people's participation in social management effective. The conception and political practice of the RCP and its secretary general concerning this important aspect of the democratic political process are characterized by a thoroughly dialectical spirit. The institutional system was "approached" from the consideration that the organizational forms and practical activity must not be static but perfected to meet the requirements of every stage of social development. As the party secretary general pointed out, what was right for one stage may be unsuited to another and even obstruct development. This is a field wherein the originality and innovating character of President Nicolae Ceausescu's thinking and the function of social innovation performed by the party as the leading political force of society have been manifested most strikingly. This innovating theoretical approach and creative activity have resulted in continuing structural improvement in socialist Romania's political system, making it a uniform, harmonious and coherently articulated system of the workers revolutionary socialist democracy, a system combining public with state elements, representative with direct democracy, and uniform social management with the forms of self-management of workers on all levels and in all socioeconomic activities.

A Powerful Factor For the Nation's General Progress

Since the Ninth Party Congress especially, the continuing improvement of the Romanian political system has proved to be a powerful factor for expediting the nation's general progress.

The structure of the Romanian political system in the present stage of national development and as an illustration of the level of progress we have reached contains components with the most varied functions and roles. They are articulated so as to create role structures suited to the functions the political system is expected to perform in building the fully developed socialist society.

Upon analyzing the components of the political system's structure, we obtain the following picture: The RCP is the main element performing the role of leading political force for the entire political system and accordingly for the whole social system. According to the Romanian Constitution, the central and local organs of state power (the Grand National Assembly, the State Council and the president of Romania as supreme organs of state power and the people's councils as local ones) are the only organs that exercise political power as state power, being representative, elective organs. The twofold party and state organs are an original distinctive feature of the Romanian political system, reflecting the combination of party and state activity. Among those we mention the Supreme Council for Economic and Social Development, the Council for Socioeconomic Organization, the Central Council for Workers Control of Economic and Social Activity, the National Council for Science and Technology, the Council for Socialist Culture and Education, et al. The democratic forums of direct democracy are organized as national congresses for the main social activities and also have their permanent executive organs. The Socialist Democracy and Unity Front is defined by the Constitution as "the broadest permanent revolutionary, democratic, and representative political body, forming the organizational structure for uniting

under the RCP's leadership the political and social forces of the socialist Romanian nation and all its mass and public organizations on behalf of the entire people's participation in implementing the party's and state's domestic and foreign policies and in management of all activities." Then there are the bodies for workers self-management, and then the organs of the state administration, performing executive functions and including the Council of Ministers along with the ministries and the other central organs under it and the executive committees of the people's councils with the local organs of the state administration specialized in various fields. The judicial organs, consisting of the Supreme Court, the county courts, and other courts of law, are entrusted with the administration of justice. The organs of the Prosecutor's Office supervise according to law the criminal prosecution organs and those executing penalties, law enforcement, and protection of the socialist order, the legitimate rights and interests of the socialist organizations, the other juristic persons, and the citizens. The mass communication media are channels of communication and information that play an important part in processing and disseminating cultural and educational values and political culture, and accordingly in political socialization of the members of society.

We should point out that the above-mentioned components do not entirely exhaust the structure of the Romanian political system. Despite the assertions of the maligners of socialism, it is not a society closed to innovations or encased in rigid forms. On the contrary, it is a live and dynamic organism receptive to all improvements, and the same is true of its political system. Changes in the socialist political system, which reflects the requirements for further improvement of the social system as a whole, are made by creating both new institutions or organizations and new functions for the already existing bodies, which functions reflect the enrichment of the content and forms of their activities, and also by changing the ways existing functions are performed in order to make them broader, more intensive, and in full accord with the principles of socialist democracy and revolutionary humanism. Therefore the analyst of such a system may be confronted with structures and mechanisms not found in other contexts and not intelligible in terms of traditional political categories. In a radically innovating revolutionary process that is renovated itself in its development to meet the demands of rapid and all-around progress, it is inevitable and therefore quite natural for new forms to arise that are not included in previous typologies because they are original in nature, enhancing the structure of the political system and improving its performances in order to accomplish the main strategic aims and to realize the values on which it is based.

The continuing combination of innovating theories with creation of new political structures capable of better performances is significant in this connection. Therefore an attempt to judge a socialist political system like the Romanian one by criteria taken from situations foreign to socialism can be of no help in understanding the real nature of such a system but is more of a political diversion. Here are a few examples. There is a well-known tendency in the literature of western political science to identify the democratism of a political system with the existence of several parties and their legal, constitutional competition. By making an absolute criterion of that situation, peculiar to most capitalist countries because of their antagonistic social structure, and a touchstone of the democratic or undemocratic character of a political system, bourgeois ideologists have compiled typologies from this specious viewpoint maintaining

that socialism is "incompatible" with democracy. But the real question is not the number of political parties but adequate and effective representation of the interests of all social classes and categories in making decisions, and from that standpoint the theory of the so-called inevitable necessity of the plural party system regardless of the social, economic and political conditions is based solely on a forced projection of the model of conflicting class interests peculiar to capitalist society upon all social systems regardless of their nature.

Romanian socialist society has proved that a single party as a leading political force has succeeded as an authentic factor for progress and a source of development of authentic democratism. Development of the party's political leadership in no way means monopolizing political activity. On the contrary, it must and does lead to the entire people's more intensive participation in the socioeconomic and political activity of society and to improvement and diversification of the organizational structure for the participation of all social categories in democratic management of the state.

What is more, it may be said that political activity properly speaking is not limited to governmental or party forms in the Romanian political system, as can be seen from its structure. It takes many forms facilitated and implemented through the broad network of social organizations permitting and encouraging mass participation in social management. As the party secretary general pointed out, it may be said about this that Romania's quite distinctive political pluralism without several competing parties has great advantages over that of the countries with several parties because it is achieving a new kind of democracy incomparably superior to the previously known one. The evolution of the FDUS /Socialist Democracy and Unity Front⁷, an organism somewhat similar to other national front organisms in various socialist countries, is significant in this respect. Until 1968 the People's Democracy Front was uniting the mass organizations under the RCP's lead in election campaigns only, and accordingly had a limited social-political role. The formation of the Socialist Unity Front proved to be an important forward step toward founding a political organism also capable of ensuring adequate representation of the particular group interests of all social categories and organizations and increasingly extensive and effective participation of those organizations, and of the workers through them, in state management. This event was also symbolic of the achievement, on a higher level, of the entire people's unity of will and action and socialist Romania's cohesion. Later on the process was intensified and improved by founding the Socialist Democracy and Unity Organization, including 4 million citizens in cities and villages. In this new phase, citizens in the FDUS who are not party members participate in politics not only through the front's various social, public, professional, creative and other organizations but also through their opportunity for individual participation as members of the new mass political organization. It is an original approach that brilliantly meets the twofold demand made on any truly democratic political system, namely adequate representation of interests and effective political participation, with one political party as the political leader of society.

The same thing could be said about some bourgeois political scientists' objection to the possibility of democratic dialogue in socialist society, as seen only in the distorting mirror of the limitations of capitalist society. On the principle that no good management is possible under the present circumstances without increasingly close communication with the masses, the RCP has instituted

and developed a permanent dialogue with the masses through constantly improved methods that supplement the broad and comprehensive institutional system of Romania's political structures. Dialogue and consultation with the workers, all categories of citizens, and the entire people have become basic constants of the activity and leadership of the party and state and especially of the party secretary general and president of Romania. There is practically no decision nor any important law that is not submitted to widespread discussion of public opinion in Romania.

In the course of the same process of socialist reportioning of the democratic political process, continuing improvements have been made in the ways the workers collectives in all activities exercise control over enforcement of the laws of the land and the party and state decisions.

Another question arising from the nature of this period, characterized as we know by the scientific-technical revolution's rapid advance, is what bourgeois ideologists usually regard as a contradiction between scientific rationalization of decisions and maintenance of the democratic structures. The technocratic doctrines proclaim the ultimate depoliticization of management and the inevitable demise of democracy through institution of a system that is merely another kind of elitist, authoritarian and thoroughly antidemocratic government.

It is important to note that the RCP has given an original and creative answer to the questions raised by the contemporary requirements for development of the political system, which requirements arise from both the general demands of the scientific-technical revolution and the particular ones of the present developmental stage of the Romanian socialist system. The party has accordingly rejected the idea of a fatal and irreparable conflict between scientific rationalization of decision-making and democratic development, and it has also opposed the spontaneous interpretation of automatic assertion of the superiority of socialism in this area, stressing the need of thorough theoretical and practical efforts to materialize and exploit that superiority. The solution to those twofold requirements was the result of theoretical studies in depth and practical experiments, and it was finalized in the party secretary general's works through institutionalized generalization of the principles of collective management on all levels and in all fields, which generalization can accomplish the aims of scientific rationalization of the decision-making process and of social management as a whole by democratic methods, structures and mechanisms able to combine the competence of the specialists with the experience and energy of the masses. That is why Nicolae Ceausescu characterized this solution as one of revolutionary importance to Romanian society.

Better Quality of Life As the Basic Aim

Since it is intended to organize and stimulate the energies of all members of society and to facilitate effective management through the workers' widest possible participation in making and then implementing decisions, the Romanian political system is structured so that it can manage effectively and coordinate its various components uniformly at the same time. This is necessary and possible because the supreme goal of the political system as a whole or of any political activity is to meet the individual's material and cultural needs more and more adequately, to develop his personality fully and harmoniously, and to enhance the people's quality of life.

The combination of party activity with that of the state, the public organizations, and the workers self-management bodies, creation of new institutionalized forms to effect that combination as efficiently as possible and in keeping with the values of socialism, and the action of principles in the management field (rotation of personnel, multiple functions, and obligatory representation of the party organs, the social and public organizations and the workers in the state, economic, social, cultural and other bodies up to the highest levels) reflect a qualitatively higher developmental stage of the socialist political system, some new kinds of political relations, and some new political structures wherein the strictly political character (in the classic sense) of the specialized political institutions are being "eroded" and forms, mechanisms and structures for participation that were not political by nature are being "politicized" in a new sense. The main thrust of these processes is expansion and reinforcement of the self-management of the workers, and especially workers self-management, in order to further accentuate in the future the principle of the workers self-government or, as Marx called it, the "free self-determination" of the people themselves.

While the RCP in its entire activity has combatted any tendencies to make fetishes of the institutional forms created at a given point or in a given stage and has claimed and implemented their necessary further improvement, by the same token we must emphasize its effort, as a leading political force of society and a central element of the political system, to implement the true values of socialism in the political system's procedures, working methods and political approach.

It is significant here that Romania was the first socialist country to code the principles and standards of socialist ethics and justice. The code has not only an ethical value but also a predominantly political one, and its provisions became components of the RCP Program for Construction of the Fully Developed Socialist Society and for Romania's Advance Toward Communism. It also brings out the process of extending the scope of the political system to the field of social standards as a characteristic feature of the stage we are in, as well as the political importance of the ethical aspect of individual and collective behavior. It was in this light that the essential fact was considered that the democratic and humanist principles guiding the formation of the various structures and bodies become effective and efficient when an approach and methods in keeping with those principles are consistently promoted in their actual work, because this actual work of people and the persons with responsibilities on various levels makes up the real content of any social structure or of any institution or organization. Without a suitable approach and adequate methods the intended purpose of improving the structures is liable to be impaired by perfunctory routine and become politically ineffective. Accordingly, we can regard application of the social standards and values by incorporating them in the real political relations and consistent pursuit of the people's real interests as developmental trends of the Romanian socialist political system.

The constantly improved coordination of the political structures with the political approach reveals the correlation that exists between development of the political system with its capacity and performances and development of the political culture as a generalized civic culture, especially since in the present and future stages improvement of the political awareness or in a broader sense the political culture of the masses and all citizens is indispensable to further improvement and consolidation of the political system and to the development of society as a whole.

The extensive party program for theoretical-ideological, political and cultural-educational work is primarily intended to intensify efforts to develop socialist awareness, form the new man, and encourage all workers' creative participation regardless of nationality in ideological, political and cultural activity for purposes of building the fully developed socialist society. All this is required of the political system because the quality of the citizens' responsible participation in attainment of the goals set in the spirit of the socialist values and standards is critical in the present stage, and each one must combine professional-technical competence with socialist civic awareness to the best of his ability.

The development of the Romanian political system as a system of workers revolutionary socialist democracy is identical and interdependent with enhancement of the masses' knowledge and their ideological and political level. In the last analysis the identity and unity of those processes come out in their common purpose of securing the rapid, comprehensive and harmonious development of the social system as a whole (in all its aspects and components) and of the new socialist man's personality.

The RCP is both the leader of the Romanian political system and the vital center of the Romanian social system as a whole. It has been the mobilizing force of the people's energies toward consistent attainment of their revolutionary goals and it has also activated and enhanced the creative value of the activity of the masses, who have become the active subject of the political process instead of its object.

Further improvement of the Romanian political system and consequent enhancement of its capacity for social innovation and mobilization and development of the whole social organism necessarily requires further development of the party's leadership in society. Nicolae Ceausescu said, "In the present stage of Romanian society's development, when socialist democracy is developing and the democratic structure for mass participation in management of all sectors is improving, it is the high mission of the RCP to serve as the political force that organizes and stimulates all socioeconomic activity. It is and will remain the vital center of operations of Romanian socialist society."

5186

CSO: 2700/259

ROUNDTABLE ON STATE, PUBLIC PROPERTY

Bucharest ERA SOCIALISTA in Romanian No 16, 20 Aug 84 pp 38-48

/Discussion by Univ Prof Dr Ioan Ceterchi, Univ Lecturer Dr Cornel Birsan, Univ Reader Dr Mircea Bota, Univ Prof Dr Gheorghe Cretoiu, Univ Prof Dr Nita Dobrota, Dr Teofil Pop, Dr Maria Stanescu, Univ Lecturer Dr Marin Traistaru and Dr Mari-lena Uliescu: "Improvement of Ownership Relations in the Present Stage of Romania's Development"

/Text/ The Antifascist and Anti-imperialist Revolution for Social and National Liberation in August 1944 opened the way to radical reforms in all areas of Romanian society. Chief among them were the abolition of private-capitalist ownership and relations of exploitation and oppression and the takeover of the prerogatives of owners of the national wealth by the working class and the workers as the true creators of all material and cultural values. The Act of nationalization in June 1948, legalizing transfer of the main production means to the workers' ownership as property of the entire people also marked the beginning of socialist ownership in Romania. Abolition of relations of exploitation in agriculture as well in the following years and the socialist agrarian reforms unified the Romanian economy, and on that basis the worker-peasant alliance was further consolidated and the ownership of the entire people and cooperative ownership were further strengthened and developed.

The economic and social changes made after the Ninth Party Congress especially lent Romanian society new characteristics and brought about a powerful, uninterrupted dynamism in the national economy's development, further improvement of social and production relations, and the formation of the system of workers revolutionary democracy. In the present stage of Romanian society's development the role of the workers as owners, producers and beneficiaries is operating on an increasingly high level.

The RCP and its secretary general regard workers self-management and development of socialist property as prime factors for construction of the fully developed socialist society and the advance toward communism. In view of the social nature of ownership, labor and distribution, the RCP felt it necessary to make some explanations of the concept of ownership in order to better correlate it with the current facts of Romanian socialist society. To that end it was pointed out that the entire people's ownership cannot and must not be confused with

state ownership. As Nicolae Ceausescu said at the Expanded Plenum of the RCP Central Committee in June 1982, "The state is not and must not be an owner in the legal sense of the word. Social ownership belongs to the people. The state is only an instrument in the hands of the working class, the workers regardless of nationality, and the entire people for the organized achievement of socioeconomic development."

The clarifications of the concept of ownership, determination of the state's entire role as general administrator of the entire people's property, and the greater awareness and intensive application of the workers' capacity as owners depend heavily upon continued improvement of the principles of ownership and social organization. As owners of the national wealth, the workers have greater responsibilities for maintenance and protection of property and for its prudent and most efficient management. In its turn the state as representative of the entire people exercises control and sees that the national wealth and the workers' property are managed as well as possible, and it makes a constant effort on behalf of application of the principles of self-management and self-administration as well as further growth of economic effectiveness. It is also the state's responsibility to provide alike for the protection and the development of both forms of socialist property, both that of the entire people and cooperative property, in the interest of successful socialist and communist construction.

The discussion with the foregoing title, arranged by ERA SOCIALISTA, is devoted to such major aspects of improved ownership relations in the present stage of Romanian society. We are publishing an abridged stenographic record of the discussion in this issue.

IOAN CETERCHI: Our discussion of improved ownership relations is to analyze the new socioeconomic facts from the theoretical standpoint as well as the evolution of social and production relations in the stage of building the fully developed socialist society. It is a particularly timely and practically important subject for the progress of socialist society and the enhancement of workers revolutionary democracy in Romania.

In connection with improvement of the democratic system of mass participation in management, of workers self-management, and of the economic-financial mechanism, the question inevitably arose of improving economic relations and especially ownership relations. The conclusion was reached that the principle of "the state owner" is unsuited to the present stage of Romanian society and development of socialist democracy on the basis of self-management and self-administration, because it maintains in a way the alienation of the workers from the means of production.

As we know, in making an in-depth analysis of the stage reached by socialist production relations and by ownership relations in the course of them* Nicolae Ceausescu said that the workers revolutionary democratic state is not an owner in the legal sense of the entire people's socialist ownership as one of the forms of socialist ownership.

I feel that the interpretation of the significance of the theoretical explanations made of the concept of the entire people's right of socialist ownership and their economic, legal and social consequences is facilitated by reviewing,

*At the Expanded Plenum of the RCP Central Committee in June 1982.

even if briefly, the high points in the creation and development of socialist ownership in Romania in its entirety. In the course of the changes made during the years following the victory of the Antifascist and Anti-imperialist Revolution for Social and National Liberation in August 1944, the workers became the true owners of the production means and private-capitalist ownership was abolished, radically changing the status and role of the masses in society as well as the socioeconomic and legal relations between the citizen and the state. The old economic relations between the private owners of the production means and the producers of the material goods, which were the basis of exploitation, were gradually eliminated from society and replaced by new relations whereby the workers gained a new social status with prospects of the right to become real owners of the material wealth. The Constitution of 1948 proclaimed that "The means of production... that are private property of individuals or juristic persons may become state property, that is property of the people..." But the act of nationalization in June 1948 made the people owners through the intermediary of the state, not direct owners.

Due to the economic, social and political conditions after nationalization, the stage of the revolutionary process, and the aims of socialist construction, the relations between the state and the workers acquired a number of features that primarily consisted of protection and guarantees of their rights as sovereign holders of the power and owners of the public wealth and their right, in those capacities, to manage the economic units directly and to participate in making decisions concerning their own activity. Socialist ownership became the foundation of the masses' power and of a real democracy wherein every worker as owner, producer and also beneficiary of economic and social progress has the right to participate in the act of management.

The further democratization of economic activity, especially since the Ninth Party Congress, and the continued formation and improvement of a broad network of bodies through which the workers share in the management of the socioeconomic units and of society as a whole and exercise their prerogatives as real owners of the national wealth came into conflict with the old economic and legal conception and with some regulatory enactments, including the Constitution, declaring part of socialist ownership to be state ownership. This meant an artificial transfer of ownership attributes from the natural owners, the people, to the state, whereas actually, as it was pointed out at the Expanded Plenum of the RCP Central Committee in June 1982, the state should not be the legal holder of property in the socialist ownership of the entire people because that would interfere both with the full development of economic democracy and of the economic-financial mechanism perfected in recent years and with the direct unification of the producers with the production means and consequently with their greater responsibility for the prudent and efficient management of the public wealth.

NITA DOBROTA: The explanations made about the holder of the right of ownership of property composing the entire people's collective property are no ends in themselves nor mere changes in terminology. On the contrary, their effects are very far-reaching and diversified, from economic and legal ones to those concerning socialist awareness and awareness of real ownership of a part of the national wealth.

In my opinion that last aspect is more important than the other effects (economic, legal etc.) of the new concept of the entire people's socialist ownership

because the legal and economic effects of the change of the holder of the entire people's right of socialist ownership result from the manifestation of awareness of ownership. Actually, those effects merely confirm a de facto situation, namely that the workers are primarily owners and as such they become beneficiaries of the results of their own socioeconomic activity. The relationship between the extent of the profit made and the quantity and quality of the work is clearer from this viewpoint, because it indicates that the extent of the profit made depends upon the extent to which the prerogatives of ownership of the property and production means are assumed and exercised. In fact, all the improvements made in the last few years in the economic-financial mechanism and the political-legal measures taken to intensify workers self-management and self-administration are ultimately intended to form and generalize the feeling that every producer is also the owner of the production means and other property entrusted to the economic units for their administration and efficient management. Formation of the feeling and awareness of ownership of a part of the national wealth is a highly complex process resulting from the combined action of many political, economic, legal, ideological and other instruments. I do not think any one of them can be considered absolute or emphasized at the expense of another. It is first a matter of a broader political-economic profiling of a holder of the right to the entire people's socialist ownership and then one of determining the implications of another kind.

IOAN CETERCHI: The political-economic profiling of the new concept of the entire people's ownership was followed by a number of legislative qualifications as a direct result of Party Secretary General Nicolae Ceausescu's suggestion to base ownership relations on new legal standards, thus increasing every workers collective's responsibility in the administration and development of socialist property.

I think the interpretation of the significance and consequences of the new concept of the entire people's socialist ownership is also facilitated by integration of this theoretical clarification in the series of improvements made in Romanian socialist democracy, or actually in the democratic ways of exercising power. The Romanian party and state are promoting the combination of representative and direct democracy and accordingly the direct participation of the masses in the exercise of power. Of course we have not given up the system of representative organs, but we have inevitably and necessarily had to develop the direct forms of democracy, and the new concept of the entire people's socialist ownership is inseparable from the methods of direct exercise of workers revolutionary democracy. That is why this change was included and is being integrated in the general process of improving social relations and social management and implementing self-management and self-administration, as a result of the investigation of the new socioeconomic developments in Romania.

GHEORGHE CRETOIU: I agree with Ioan Ceterchi's view that improvement of ownership relations in Romania must be approached and understood as part of the overall process of improving production relations and building the fully developed socialist society. On the one hand ownership relations are an integral part of production relations, with an essential place among them that determines their very nature and characteristics. On the other hand, such an approach brings out the interdependence between ownership and production relations properly speaking, relations of exchange, distribution etc., their mutual influences, and their effect upon the whole process of socioeconomic development.

I think some of the directions the RCP has been taking to improve ownership relations should be noted, such as (1) increasing and developing the national wealth, which is the material-economic content of socialist ownership, (2) improving the ways and means of organization and management to secure the best background for the exercise of socialist ownership as a social production relation, (3) securing a closer correlation of the forms and relations of ownership with the relations of distribution and their forms and principles, and (4) strengthening the legislation on socialist ownership and correlating it more closely with the mechanisms of self-management and economic-financial self-administration.

By their nature, socialist ownership relations figure primarily in the processes of production and socialist expanded reproduction. They are not limited to nor do they primarily concern appropriation of the value created by work but pertain particularly to the socialist form of appropriation and use of the production means in a collective. It is only in this connection and on this basis that socialist ownership takes the form of appropriation of part of the newly created value in the production process, but that appropriation takes place through the intermediary of distribution relations. The production means, as a main component of the national wealth, actually functions as a production factor in combination with the labor force in and through the production process. Therefore I agree with those who think the holder of the entire people's right of ownership is exercising his prerogatives that flow from his capacity both as a direct owner through the system of self-management and self-administration and an indirect one in the course of representative democracy.

Self-management and self-administration are forms of functioning and exercise of ownership as a socialist relation both through the system of collective management and administration and through the direct correlation of the results of internal economic activity with the size and evolution of the expanded reproduction funds. In this way ownership is formed to an increasing extent in the direct relations among the members of the collectives in the respective enterprises, and it operates through its direct administration by those collectives, while the framework for the social manifestation of ownership is also broadened by the organization and concentration of production in the economic units and also by multiplication and perpetuation of the economic units' forms of cooperation and collaboration pertaining to the two forms of socialist ownership. The unified agroindustrial councils, the intercooperative associations, and the associations of state and cooperative units provide such a framework wherein, along with development of production, there is also a consolidation and regular collaboration between the two forms of socialist ownership in all stages of the social reproduction process. I think these aspects should be further analyzed from the standpoint of their implications and role in the process of change and development of ownership and self-management, and also from the standpoint of their possibilities for equalizing the two forms of ownership.

MIRCEA BOTA: From the standpoint of the previously mentioned relationship between improvement of ownership relations and improvement of society in general, I would like to discuss further the established relationship, on a broader scale, between socialist ownership and the socialist system.

As the basic, primary economic relationship in the system of socialist economic relations, socialist ownership is the foundation of the new social order and the

source of the entire people's socioeconomic progress and prosperity. Despite its position as a basic, central economic category and its decisive effect upon the other socialist social and economic categories, the economic category of socialist ownership has been little studied so far, and in my opinion it has been presented with some theoretical inadequacies that have limited the full perception and exercise of the workers' capacity as united owners, such as the identification of the entire people's socialist ownership with state ownership due to misinterpretation of the direct social nature of socialist ownership, which is one of its essential characteristics; the simplistic, one-sided and limited presentation of the economic relationship of socialist ownership merely as one of dominion and acquisition of the production means and results of production, whereby the relations among the members of socialist society regarding appropriation of the goods and services are partially and incompletely reflected; the incomplete presentation of the numerous and far-reaching aspects of the workers' capacity as socialist owners, especially in regard to profits and their responsibility for rational and efficient use and management of the production means; limiting the explanation of socialist ownership relations to the productive sector, although they are also present and increasingly active in the nonproductive sector of the national economy; contrasting the entire people's ownership with cooperative ownership and regarding the latter as an inferior form of socialist ownership; and insufficient study of the actual application of socialist ownership through general, direct, active and full exercise of the workers' capacity as coowners in all areas of the social reproduction process.

In criticism of these shortcomings in the study and presentation of socialist ownership, Nicolae Ceausescu said that "It is a mistake to identify social ownership, the ownership of the entire people, with state ownership. The state is not and must not be an owner in the legal sense of the word. Social ownership belongs to the people... Therefore we must consider and make some improvements in the concept of ownership and strengthen the awareness and effective exercise of the workers' capacity as owners." He added that the attitude to the effect that cooperative ownership is an inferior form of socialist ownership must be permanently eliminated because the state is equally responsible for the protection and development of both forms of socialist property, since they form the technical-material base of socialist and communist construction.

I think the considerable development, in the present stage, of the role and importance of the workers' perception and more effective, direct, general and complete presence in their capacity as socialist owners necessarily calls for thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the content of socialist ownership relations and of the aspects of the capacity as socialist owners that the members of socialist society have.

I regard socialist ownership as a very far-reaching, objective economic relationship determined by the level and nature of the productive forces and especially by the subjective legal relationship of the right of ownership, which is its legal reflection. It has been established and developed in the form of objective social relations characteristic of socialism among the members of socialist society concerning their appropriation of the public property that is its material object.

CORNEL BIRSAN: I too would like to stress the point that ownership is a part of production relations, alongside the relations among people in the social

production system and the distribution relations, and it is accordingly a component of the base of society, which has been and is being constantly improved in its entirety. The RCP and its secretary general regard this improvement as a general process that also calls for improvement of ownership relations. Nor do I think we should overlook the twofold meaning of the concept of ownership as an economic category and as a legal institution. We are speaking of ownership in the economic sense, meaning the social relations wherein the natural requirements of the production process are appropriated by man, and in the legal sense of the right of ownership as a series of legally protected attributes whereby the holder of the right of ownership serves his interests in connection with the appropriation of property, which interests are determined by and dependent upon economic ownership relations.

MIRCEA BOTA: I do not think the two meanings can be entirely separated. I would even add that their economic and legal effects interact with the effects of ownership in a broader sense, particularly that of the radical changes that have taken place in the concept of ownership in the years of socialist revolution and construction.

As it has been mentioned in our discussion, the act of nationalization in 1948 transferred the right of ownership of the production means from a private owner to a collective owner, namely the people. Economically speaking, socialist ownership establishes the socialist social dominion of all members of society or of various groups of socialist cooperative members over the production means and other property. This appropriation is the main feature of socialist ownership relations, and it takes the following forms: (a) general social dominion of all members of society over the property that is the object of the entire people's socialist ownership; (b) collective social dominion of groups of socialist cooperative members over the property that is the object of the cooperative socialist ownership; and (c) dominion in the form of collective administration by the workers in the state socialist units of that part of the entire people's wealth that is entrusted to their management.

In its entirety, dominion over the property in socialist ownership presents a new content that is reflected in several characteristic features. Exercise of the dominion over the respective property by all members of society and all members of the workers collectives lends it a general-social nature, and the fact that this property belongs equally to all members of society sharing in the dominion relations determines its equal nature, while the exercise of dominion over this property without intermediaries lends it a direct character (The state is not an owner). Since the prerogatives of ownership are exercised equally and simultaneously by the members of society, they can be exercised only in common by using the forms of socialist democracy to the exclusion of the individualistic, bureaucratic forms. The very great extent and very high level of socialist socialization of property give socialist dominion a broad scope, while the characteristics and trends of socialist production and reproduction lend it stability, continuity, and a tendency to develop and consolidate.

The new content of socialist dominion is also reflected in its conformity, orientation and exercise in the direction of the general welfare and all-around development of all members of socialist society.

Socialist social dominion over property in socialist ownership does away with the workers' separation from the property and completely unites the human with the material factor, eliminating the economic inequality basic to exploitation and oppression and places the members of society in an equal position vis-a-vis the production means and other public property, on the basis of which all of them qualify as joint owners of same. Socialist dominion over the production means and other public property is the critical feature of socialist ownership, functioning as a basic economic requirement for socialist production and reproduction. Through its characteristics of general, direct, continuous, stable and broadly democratic social appropriation, socialist dominion over the production means and other public property makes socialist ownership equitable, stimulating, stable and indivisible on the level of socialization of the national economy or on that of the group of cooperative members. The fact that it excludes some possibilities of private possession of socialist property for individualistic, selfish and commercial-speculative purposes and that it excludes exploitation is nothing negative but, on the contrary, a mark of its superiority. Consequently the workers' capacity as joint socialist owners of the public wealth also has a real, rich, stable and equitable content that extensively encourages their useful, creative and effective work and their generally responsible attitude in all activities.

IOAN CETERCHI: I think it is significant from this standpoint that sound and efficient administration of socialist property as a whole is not confined to the exercise by the workers in the economic units of their prerogatives as owners of the production means and of other property as well, nor to mere economic or legal methods of managing them. It also includes acts of economic policy, of planning economic development, and of distribution of the productive forces throughout the country.

This activity cannot be performed by the people directly, but only through representation. Since the people are constitutionally a legal entity, they exercise their prerogatives as owners (Here I mean only the activity of planning the national economy) through the Grand National Assembly, the supreme legislative forum and the sole legislative organ of the state that approves, according to the Constitution, the Uniform National Plan of Socioeconomic Development. In this way the state performs a number of functions in connection with management of the public wealth, which is owned by the entire people. I am referring, for example, to the state's planned management of the national economy and to use of economic laws for development and reproduction of socialist property, growth of the public wealth, and harmonious development of the productive forces.

Of course some legal questions arise about the new concept of the entire people's ownership and its legal, economic and other consequences. A number of articles and discussions expressing interesting views have already appeared in the technical literature. But some of them are not unanimously accepted. On the contrary, corrections have been made in them, sound comments have been made about them, and a consensus seems to be forming to the effect that we cannot approach the subject of the right of socialist ownership under the present circumstances on the basis of the old legal concept of the right of ownership, which we have used even in socialism.

CORNEL BIRSAN: However the right of ownership cannot be defined in the terms of just one branch of law, let us say civil law. Short of going into legal

technicalities, I would like to say that the people as a whole are not subjects of civil law but are subjects of constitutional law. But on the other hand, the right of ownership means that its holder exercises the attributes of ownership in his own right and in his own interest, without requesting the consent of another and for his own benefit. Therefore I think, as it has already been mentioned here, that a definition of the right of socialist ownership belonging to the entire people must be approached from the positions of several branches of law. Of course the lawyers' conclusions need to be supplemented with those of economists, political scientists et al. because socialist ownership is not only a concept with legal meanings and implications but also an economic and social-political category.

IOAN CETERCHI: Actually the new concept must be analyzed theoretically from a broader, interdisciplinary perspective and especially from that of improvement of the socioeconomic structures and the workers' threefold capacity in regard to the production means. Clearly we have to deal with a new institution with extensive economic, social and legal implications, and therefore we must try to analyze its features, aspects, nature, consequences and the form it takes. Progress in this direction was made by Law No 2 of 1983 on the Fundamental Principles of Improvement of the System for Wages and Distribution of Workers Incomes and Law No 3 of 1983 on the Pledge-Contract. Those regulatory acts made a number of qualifications of the state's capacity as general administrator of the entire people's socialist property and the functions of the other state organs in regard to the entire people's property, namely the government, the economic ministries, and the state socialist units. The capacity of the workers and workers collectives to administrate and manage the production means entrusted to them was also qualified.

MARILENA ULIESCU: The revolutionary change made in the concept of socialist ownership does not detract in any way from the Romanian socialist state's role in managing economic and social activity. On the contrary, when each workers collective's share in management of the portion of the national wealth entrusted to it is increased, the state's role and functions in securing steady and harmonious economic growth will be strengthened and will undergo a new development. In the light of these new developments we should reconsider the old doctrines of the twofold capacity in which the state acts upon the property that makes up the entire people's wealth, that is its capacity as holder of the power and as holder of the right of state socialist ownership at the same time. By continuing to act as the entire people's representative, the state performs its functions as general administrator of the property belonging to the people.

The state's previously recognized capacity as holder of the right of socialist ownership and its capacity as general administrator of the national wealth do not have the same scope. I think the concept of general administrator is broader, calling for certain activities that do not directly pertain to exercise of the prerogatives of the right of ownership. Note that the state performs and will perform in the future "administrative" activities that go beyond the sphere of property belonging to the entire people (property that is the object of the right of ownership of the cooperative organizations and other public organizations). Of course it is not a matter of direct administration of this property through a possible limitation of the prerogatives belonging to the cooperative organizations, but rather one of determining the general scope of the

administration of this property in order to serve not only the interests of the owner units but also the general interests of the entire people.

I am by no means maintaining that the state exercises the same prerogatives over the property in the entire people's ownership and over that in the ownership of the cooperative units or other public organizations. But I am stressing the unity of purpose characterizing the state's efforts to make good use of the property that is the object of the two forms of socialist ownership, as well as the fact that the methods used for this purpose are also the same or very similar. Before it is the general administrator of the entire people's property, the state acts in its capacity as supreme representative of the owners and producers and all the members of socialist society, regardless of the economic or social-cultural sector wherein they work.

Accordingly, planning all social and economic activity (aspects also mentioned by Ioan Ceterchi) is one of the first functions of the state in its capacity as general administrator. By drafting the Uniform National Plan for Socioeconomic Development and adopting it through its organs, the state sets standards and goals for all workers collectives regardless of who owns the property on which their activity is based. To be sure the planning methods differ with the activity to which they apply, but once the plan becomes law its provisions are equally binding on the state organs and organizations as well as the cooperative units and other public organizations.

In this way the principles of socialist democracy and workers self-management are implemented not only in the socialist units but also in the exercise of working-class leadership on all economic and social levels in Romania, for improvement of ownership relations requires not only improved forms of workers participation in management of the socialist units but also further improvement in the forms of their participation in the work of the organs of the state as general administrator of the entire people's property.

GHEORGHE CRETOIU: One of the instruments the Romanian state uses to exercise its prerogatives as general administrator of the entire people's property is the pledge-contract, whereby the workers as owners of the production means, producers and beneficiaries assume their particular tasks and are responsible for developing and protecting the property entrusted to the economic units wherein they work, for its proper management and administration, and for the economic results obtained.

In this way the workers collectives as well as the ministries and other central organs and each and every worker acquire (through the individual pledge) precise functions for proper and efficient management of all property entrusted on the principles of workers self-management and of economic-financial self-administration.

MARILENA ULIESCU: In the case of property in the entire people's ownership, the state is not limited to setting the economic units' tasks in conformity with the Uniform National Plan, but according to the provisions of Law No 3 of 1983 on the pledge-contract it entrusts each unit's property to the workers on the basis of the contract for direct exercise of the prerogatives and responsibilities accruing to the members of the workers collectives as owners, producers and beneficiaries. In this aspect the state as general administrator of the entire

people's property is represented by the ministries and the other central or local organs under which the enterprises and centrals entrusted with the respective property are operating. The regulation of the pledge-contract provided by Law No 3 of 1983 also calls for conclusion of such contracts between the state and the ministries or other central organs or the executive committees of the county or Bucharest municipal people's councils. In that case the state is represented by the prime minister of the government, by authorization of the State Council.

I regard the legal regulation of the pledge-contract as a highly original measure reflecting the Romanian party's and state's view of workers self-management, economic-financial self-administration, and the role and responsibility of the workers collectives in the socialist units for better management and exploitation of all resources, greater economic effectiveness, and growth of the national income.

The pledge-contract between the state and the ministries or other central organs or the executive committees of the county or Bucharest municipal people's councils secures performance (through its organs) of the state's functions as the people's representative in the exercise of control and in the effort to better manage the entire people's property, not to waste it, and to further develop it so that self-management and self-administration will be consistently implemented in all units as efficiently as possible and economic effectiveness will be further enhanced. Unlike the socialist units, these organs do not hold production means or other property serving the implementation of the economic processes. They conclude the pledge-contracts, as the law specifies, in their capacity as administrators of the property of the socialist units under them. That capacity, assigned by law to this category of state administrative organs, involves an essential change in the interpretation of the state organs' position in regard to property that is part of the entire people's socialist property.

As the general administrator of the entire people's property the state legislates the regulations for all management and exploitation of the entire people's wealth and establishes the standards for determining and conducting relations among its organs and organizations, the methods of founding and organizing the socialist units and of entrusting part of the entire people's property to those units, and the rights and obligations of the workers collectives and of the various categories of workers.

MIRCEA BOTA: Concerning that last point, I believe all workers and all citizens acquire a new, comprehensive capacity under socialism which I would call a capacity as socialist coowner. The comprehensive and uniform character of socialist ownership lends a comprehensive and uniform character to the socioeconomic capacity of the members of socialist society. I think the concept of socialist coowners is the one that uniformly and comprehensively reflects this new capacity of the members of socialist society. In its broad sense, it means their capacity as joint owners of the public wealth and its entire beneficiaries, as collective managers of all socioeconomic activity, as united socialist producers of all material and cultural values obtained, and as joint administrators of the socialist units' property. Like the aspects of socialist ownership, those of socialist coownership are inseparable and interdependent, forming a single whole. Since the members of socialist society are joint owners of the national wealth, they are also its beneficiaries and have the right and the duty to work and produce the necessary material and cultural values in their general, collective interests as

well as their private ones and to manage and administrate all activity and the public property in their capacity as socialist managers and administrators.

The concept of socialist coowners, or of socialist owners, is now used in its broad sense as defined above. In its narrow sense it means joint owners of the property in socialist ownership and of the results of socioeconomic activity. But I do not think use of the concept of socialist coowners in its narrow sense is as accurate, and it has some methodological disadvantages because (a) it separates the capacity of coowners from that of producers, managers, administrators and beneficiaries, which the workers have and must exercise in their comprehensive and uniform capacity as united socialist coowners, (b) the concept of socialist ownership, which uniformly and comprehensively reflects all aspects of socialist appropriation of certain property, is not correlated with the concept of united socialist coowners, which I think is also needed to reflect uniformly and comprehensively the capacity of members of socialist society whereby all the aspects of socialist ownership are exercised, (c) if the aspects of producers, managers, administrators, and beneficiaries are separated from the comprehensive capacity of coowners of public property and of the results of labor that the workers have, their rights, functions, duties and responsibilities for developing, maintaining and protecting socialist property, which are uniform and closely correlated and interdependent, are separated and fragmented, and (d) impairment of the accuracy and clarity of the interpretation of the structural aspects of socialist ownership and of the capacity of the members of society as socialist coowners restricts the perception and full exercise of them for purposes of rational and efficient management as well as development and protection of public property.

I think it is important to mention here that the concept of "capacity as socialist owners" is used in its broad, uniform and comprehensive sense in the RCP documents and Nicolae Ceausescu's works. The party secretary general said, "We must strengthen the awareness and effective exercise of the workers' capacity as owners."

I believe the expression "owners, producers and beneficiaries" was adopted in order to emphasize the workers' obligations, responsibilities and rights, as united socialist producers and beneficiaries, as part of their comprehensive and uniform capacity as socialist coowners. By eliminating the separation of the producers from ownership of the production facilities and, temporarily, from their labor force as well, socialist ownership lends, by virtue of the comprehensive and uniform nature of its aspects, a comprehensive and uniform character to the capacity of socialist coowners that the members of society have, whereby it is characterized and exercised. For the foregoing reasons, I would opt for use of the concept of socialist coowners in its broad, comprehensive and uniform sense.

IOAN CETERCHI: Certainly the workers' status in the system of workers self-management and economic-financial self-administration, as part of their new relations with the state as general administrator of the entire people's property, is highly important. The characteristics of their threefold capacity as owners, producers and beneficiaries of the national wealth have already been specified accordingly. If we were to add to or include in this the other characteristics just viewed in a broad or narrow sense I think we would encumber the precise interpretation, in its full significance, of the position of the workers

collectives and of every individual worker vis-a-vis the entire people's socialist ownership. Therefore I think Mircea Bota's recommendation to operate with the concept of "socialist coowners" in its broad and comprehensive sense is debatable because it combines in one concept (that of "socialist coowner") the capacities of owner, producer and beneficiary, to which it adds that of manager. I think the division of the concept into a broad and narrow sense complicates matters even further.

MARIA STANESCU: I think so too. The present formula, "owners, producers and beneficiaries," is operational and has a fully defined meaning. As it was pointed out in our discussion, the whole population of the country is the collective owner of the national wealth, a fact that gives the entire people's ownership its material economic significance. The entire people participate in the administration of this national wealth through the system of self-management and self-administration and indirectly in the course of representative democracy. If the entire people are owners of the national wealth, each and every individual can be theoretically considered a coowner of socialist property, whether or not he participates in national socioeconomic development. But I think Mircea Bota overemphasizes this aspect of ownership relations in proportion to the specific exercise of the right of socialist ownership belonging to every member of society.

The great many socioeconomic units wherein the workers use the production means for material production or services belong, as we know, to the entire people or to groups of producers (cooperative members). Moreover Nicolae Ceausescu said, "The workers in an enterprise must realize that they are the owners of that enterprise, directly responsible for maintenance, protection and development of the property..."

Workers in the economic units belonging to the entire people are owners of the production means included in the property of the respective enterprises only as long as they are working in those production units. The moment they cease to do so, they may no longer participate in the production or management of the respective units. I think the participation of the producers of material goods in cooperative ownership (agricultural and artisan cooperatives) should be regarded in the same light. I think it is only in those units, to the formation of which every cooperative member has contributed his own production means and social shares, that the concept of "socialist coowners" suggested here could be used.

Interaction and cooperation of the forms of ownership in the Romanian economy are economic processes in full development that are becoming increasingly comprehensive on the level of ownership relations, namely those between cooperative ownership and the entire people's ownership managed by workers collectives; those between cooperative units or cooperative ownership and private ownership; and those between the entire people's ownership and private ownership. Short of a detailed analysis of the said processes, I would like to cite as examples the new elements that have appeared and are being consolidated in the relations between the entire people's ownership and cooperative ownership by the formation of the unified agroindustrial councils and intercooperative associations, by the affiliation of small tradesmen with state or cooperative units, and by the workers' contribution of social shares to the economic units' development funds.

Legally, these economic processes have been clarified by a whole economic legislation. Far too much space would be required to list the respective laws, but the

essential fact is that they must be improved in progress in accordance with the new needs and requirements of economic practice.

As regards the clarification and improvement to be made in the concept of ownership under socialism and in the workers' composite economic, legal and sociopolitical status as well, I think we must begin with a specific analysis of the socioeconomic phenomena, interpretation of their objective character, and their nature. Any theoretical approach is valid if our knowledge of the facts is correct. On the basis of this dialectical relationship we can present the radical changes more accurately that have been made in socialist society by nationalization and appropriation (economic and political-legal) of the main production means and abolition of exploitation of the producers' labor for the benefit of capitalist owners.

NITA DOBROTA: From this viewpoint, the entire people's socialist ownership directly and clearly reflects one of the main features of socialism's superiority over capitalism, namely its transition to a radically new situation wherein the main production means are under the dominion and administration of all members of society. This new policy makes specialists scrutinize many aspects of socialist ownership in general, such as the nature of socialist ownership and the contradictions that may arise in the exercise of the workers' prerogatives as owners, the definition of the state's role as the people's instrument for protection and development of public property in connection with other economic functions, improvement of social ownership relations in accordance with the objective economic laws, relations between economic units based on the two forms of socialist ownership, the relationship between socialist and private ownership, awareness of socialist ownership and its role in social development, etc.

IOAN CETERCHI: Of course a number of points in connection with the entire people's ownership still remain to be analyzed and clarified and should be discussed further. I am thinking, for example, of the relationship between property and the entire people on the national level, the definition of the concept of "the entire people" and determination of the meaning of the entire people's ownership, specification of the legal nature of the right of workers collectives in socialist units to the property entrusted them, etc. And there are other points that require an adequate economic and legal formulation such as, for example whether there are not some elements of the entire people's socialist ownership that still may not have been included in the pledge-contract, or the methods of incorporating some property in the entire people's property such as property without an owner, or the international implications in connection with juristic persons or holders of the right of ownership. It is certainly a very far-reaching problem, and therefore I do not think it can be resolved without the help of several social disciplines. It is an interdisciplinary problem, and the conclusions that will be drawn will be very useful for further improvement of the legislation. Therefore I agree with the opinion expressed at the beginning of the discussion, that the change of the holder of the right of the entire people's socialist ownership is not a matter of formulation but one of substance, involving modifications and renovations of some institutions in Romanian legislation beginning, I believe, with the basic law itself.

NITA DOBROTA: I also think it is not a matter of a mere change of the holder of the entire people's socialist ownership or of a "reinstatement" of the people,

but one of change in some economic relations between the workers collectives, the socialist owners, and the workers revolutionary democratic state, the state of enhanced socialist democracy. The clarifications made of the concept of socialist ownership and of the state's role as general administrator of the entire people's social property involve changes not only in some traditional legal institutions but also in some economic categories.

Ownership is a general economic category including relationships pertaining to appropriation, disposition and use of the property existing in society. It primarily indicates the workers' position in regard to the production means. But the economic category of ownership, or ownership in the economic sense, is not confined to the relationship between people and things like the relationship of ownership is, or to the right of ownership, or to acts of people's will, although it has acquired a legal sanction and is reflected in various ways in people's awareness and in their political actions. Ownership was and is not immutable or eternal, as the economists maintain who are apologists for private ownership. It had and has a historical character. In every system, ownership is objectively determined by the level and nature of the existing productive forces. Human society has known two basic types of ownership, public and private, and each type in its turn has been and is exercised in several ways. Socialist ownership is a particular form of public ownership.

Socialist ownership is defined by the relations of distribution of consumer goods and of personal use according to the quantity, quality and results of each one's work. These relations take many forms, such as those among the direct socialist producers, those between workers and economic and other units, those between different units, including those between socialist units in one country and such units in other countries, etc.

As an element characteristic of the socialist order, socialist ownership has some features and attributes that I would like to discuss further. The attribute of socialist ownership and its designation as such are based on the fact that it corresponds to the social character of the productive forces, whose development it stimulates. This means that its appropriation is collective as a provision concerning the production means and the results obtained with them.

In analyzing the social form of the appropriation of the production means in socialism, Marx, Engels and Lenin emphasized its collective character. In "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" Marx and Engels mentioned the conversion of capitalist ownership to "collective ownership belonging to all members of society." Lenin in his turn pointed out in "The State and Revolution" that "transfer of the production means to the common ownership of all society" is a historical necessity, while Engels in "Anti-Duehring" noted that the revolutionary state expropriates the expropriators "as the true representative of all society and in society's name."

But all workers' equal position vis-a-vis the existing production means and their social (collective) appropriation do not mean that each one has an equal right to a proportional share of their volume. That attribute of socialist ownership does not mean to have equally, but to be equal. The producers of the material goods are united on the level of all society or on that of the cooperative units. Socialist ownership represents the highest degree of socialization compared with the previous forms of ownership. The equal position primarily means the direct

unification of the human factor (all the workers) with the material factor (the volume of production means). No private persons intervene any longer between the material factor and the human one. In this respect the entire people's ownership makes all workers equal by eliminating the essential economic inequality of capitalism and different positions in regard to the production means. Therefore the people are the subject of socialist ownership and not the state. As Nicolae Ceausescu said, "The state is only an instrument in the hands of the working class, the workers regardless of nationality, and the entire people for the organized achievement of socioeconomic development."

Appropriation, as a planned use of the object of ownership, is another attribute of socialist ownership. It is implemented by every citizen by sharing in the social division of labor and cooperation in it and by participating directly in the activity of an economic or social unit, which activity is based on use of a part of the national wealth, namely socialist property. Therefore this attribute is exercised through the right and duty to work.

The capacities of producer and owner are combined in the person of the owner, who is a socialist producer. This does away with the antagonism in capitalism, where the owner is a nonproducer and the producer is a nonowner. Since the technical-material base is unequally developed and the members of society are unequally trained, an internal contradiction arises in socialist ownership, namely that between the equality of the members of society as regards collective disposition of the production means and the difference in appropriation as regards their particular use by each collective or individual in the course of work. The solution is to develop and equalize the technical-material base, improve qualifications, eliminate the essential differences between agricultural and industrial work and between physical and intellectual work, and strengthen workers self-management, economic-financial self-administration, and the democratic levers that secure the performance of the system created on the level of the economic units and on the national level for the workers' participation in management.

MARIN TRAISTARU: Since the entire people's socialist ownership is the essential controlling factor for economic democracy, permitting a new, uniform and coherent view of the whole system of socialist democracy and its political, legal and institutional components, I think the more comprehensive view of democracy as a composite social-political value, an integral component of socialism, and the motive force of social progress in the new order is highly significant from both the theoretical and practical standpoints. I am referring to the principles that govern the Romanian workers revolutionary democracy and the values that it consistently supports, integrates and promotes in this connection, namely profound humanism, social equity and justice, supremacy of the law as an expression of the will of the people, dynamic correlation and coordination of individual interests with the general, collective ones and efficient operation of the mechanisms for implementing them, etc. These are not only reflections of the new economic base and of socialist ownership but also essential requirements for their development and improvement.

Accordingly socialist democracy as a composite social-political value integrating the economic, political and cultural fields provides the necessary objective structure for improving the principles of ownership and of social organization and for implementing the new economic mechanism and workers self-management and

self-administration. It makes it possible in practice for working personnel to fully exercise their capacity as owners of the portion of the entire people's property that is entrusted to them for management and development. The very exercise of the democratic rights and freedoms is reflected in the workers' participation in economic and social-political management and in all the decisions pertaining to development of the enterprises through the new institutionalized bodies, such as the workers councils and general assemblies, the Workers National Congress, the Workers National Council, etc. This perpetuates the participative processes against the background of the entire people's ownership.

In this context and by exercising their rights the workers in a given enterprise are more and more fully realizing that they are the owners of that enterprise and therefore entirely responsible for the maintenance, protection and development of the property. It is their natural mission, with the means at their disposal, to keep improving economic effectiveness and the quality and productivity of labor, thus securing the necessary resources for their remuneration and profit-sharing, for accumulation and for developing the productive forces, while also meeting some general needs of the state and national defense.

The entire people's socialist ownership and the new production relations that it produces and specifically structures in industrial, agricultural, transport and other activities offer immense possibilities for progress and all workers' creative power through the transition to a new and higher quality of their performance as actual possessors of the national wealth and the production means, as producers of the material and cultural values, and as beneficiaries of the results of their labor in proportion to their real, individual and collective contribution to the development and general progress of society.

Self-management denotes a higher stage in socialization of production, labor and social responsibility, reinforcement of awareness and the democratic courses of action and decision-making, and full assertion of the revolutionary spirit, and against the background of the new economic mechanism, it provides the workers with a direct control not only over production and the results of their labor but also and to an equal extent over the activities in the fields of education, culture, science, health protection, improvement of the quality of life, etc. In that way workers self-management reflects the capacity of working personnel in enterprises and state and cooperative economic units as associate producers, which capacity is in its turn based upon those of owners of the production means and chief creators and beneficiaries of the material and cultural values, which integrate participation in management of socioeconomic, political and public affairs as regular procedures in the achievement of socialist and communist civilization.

Socialism brings about an unprecedented amplification of the people's creative energies thanks to the comprehensive and continuous character of the revolutionary process, which calls for an all-around effort to develop and renovate all social activities, the whole system of production relations, and the deepest roots of society. This creates many opportunities to enlist the workers in an activity wherein they can play an active part, display their aptitudes and talents, and make creative use of their enterprising spirit, initiative, and their capacity for creative social innovation.

NITA DOBROTA: In this very broad framework for expression of the workers' creative power and potential for social innovation, their effective participation, direct or through representatives, in responsible economic administration of the object of collective ownership is a vital aspect of ownership relations. The owner always has the right to manage (directly or through representatives) the object of his ownership. Therefore socialist ownership includes, as an essential attribute, the workers' right and obligation to manage the national wealth.

Workers self-management and economic self-administration originate in the exercise of this essential aspect of socialist ownership. Effective participation in management implies the workers' right to initiative, discussion and economic decisions as an inherent capacity of the owner. This brings out the radical difference between socialism and capitalism clearly and distinctly. On the other hand, failure to exercise this capacity (as manager) gives rise to alienation and its social and economic consequences. A certain contradiction may arise between the capacity of manager or participant in decision-making and the equal capacities of owners and producers. That contradiction is being resolved through economic, social, educational and organizational measures to encourage all workers' responsible and effective participation in decision-making and to improve the organizational and political structures for participation.

Socialist ownership is the economic basis for improving the workers' welfare and it is essential to the exercise of personal ownership on the basis of the worker's own work. This is another major aspect of the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

The capacity of owner-beneficiary is interdependent with the equal responsibility of all to work, to be direct socialist producers, and to take an active part in management. Since all these aspects are performed unequally, the workers' shares in the results obtained, or the profits received, are also differentiated. Therefore the capacity of socialist owner is exercised differently according to stages, social groups, individuals etc.

Social or collective appropriation of the production means does not conflict with the right to appropriate the results of labor by personal use. I think the critical role of socialist ownership relations in the series of economic relations is better understood in the light of several considerations, such as the dependence of the position of the classes and their relations upon the ownership relationship, the fact that relations of collaboration and mutual aid among people are based upon their equality vis-a-vis the production means and their equal, guaranteed right to participate in economic and social activities, the differing socio-economic content of the exchanges of activity and the particular ways of performing it (collaboration between the working class and the cooperative peasantry), distribution of products according to an equal criterion, quantity and quality of work, etc.

MARIA STANESCU: Improvement of production relations, in the sense of relations among people at work, first requires improvement of ownership relations, which play a decisive part in all other social relations. Therefore thorough analysis of ownership relations can lead to important conclusions for economic theory and practice.

In connection with the implications of refuting the old doctrine of the state's capacity as owner of the production means, I think that from the economic point of view some clarifications and qualifications should be made in the meaning of the general concept of socialist ownership which, of course, would also have to be correctly reflected in the legislation. In this connection I think we must distinguish two aspects of the right of socialist ownership, (1) the right of enterprises and economic organizations to administrate a part of the entire people's property via the collective management organs as the workers' representatives, and (2) the workers' right of ownership of the social shares used to develop the production means as the entire people's property.

In connection with the first aspect I would remind you of the point made by Nicolae Ceausescu at the Plenum of the RCP Central Committee of 23 March 1978, that ownership is no "abstract idea. It takes material form in the production means and other property administered by the collective management organs and workers in thousands upon thousands of socioeconomic units."

The entire people's property has been and will be developed through the contribution made at work by a growing number of persons employed in production of material and cultural values. The number of contributors to development of the entire people's property will continue to grow as the human element is used more efficiently, but there will always be a certain ratio between the employed population, with the threefold capacity of owners, producers and beneficiaries, and the total population, benefiting only by the capacity of owner and beneficiary of the national resources. The employed population has the attribute of direct participation in the production of material goods and participates in that capacity in the management of production of those goods, while the total population also includes the categories of potential producers as well as the population retired from socioeconomic activity. Noting an objective economic process, Law No 5 of 1978 on Organization and Management of State Socialist Units distinguishes the worker's capacity as owner of the production means (entire people's property) from that of producer and beneficiary of the goods produced by the collectives of the economic units. Romanian workers have the right to use, in the course of work, the production means that belong to the entire people in order to increase the national wealth and thereby increase each one's individual share of that wealth, but no one has any right of private ownership of the respective production means.

Upon this conclusion we take up the second aspect we are discussing. The workers' contribution of social shares to the economic development fund, which shares are in the ownership of the productive enterprises, bases all socioeconomic activity on the principles of self-management and self-administration, heightening every workers collective's responsibility in the administration and development of socialist property (of the entire people or cooperative). The establishment of these new ownership relations within the economic units (based on the workers' ownership of a part of the funds used by enterprises to develop the production means) enhances the relationship between common ownership and individual ownership. This brings about an interaction of personal property with the entire people's property in order to develop the latter for the benefit of all society. By forming the economic development fund with their social shares, the workers supplement their personal property with incomes in addition to the remuneration benefits due for the work performed.

MARILENA ULIESCU: The precise interpretation of the workers collectives' position as regards the production means and other property entrusted to them is vitally important, in my opinion, to the proper solution of the problems arising in connection with improvement of the entire people's right of socialist ownership. In the light of the principles of the new economic-financial mechanism, the increased responsibility of the workers collectives, and their greater role in the economic processes, I consider it axiomatic that in their use of the property in the entire people's ownership the workers in the state socialist units are acting, as collectives and in their own names, to implement the plan tasks more efficiently. This entirely covers the outlays out of incomes, formation of the units' internal funds, growth of individual incomes, fulfillment of society's general interests, and correlation of collective with individual interests. Those aims are accomplished through the independent efforts of the workers in each unit and their exercise of the prerogatives of the entire people's right of socialist ownership of the production means and other property in the inventories of the socioeconomic units.

CORNEL BIRSAN: As for the property that is the object of this right, I believe it constitutes a single resource, whether it consists of production means, products, funds or property with a special legal provision. The point should be emphasized that the single reserve of socialist property belonging to the entire people is being constantly developed, largely through expanded socialist reproduction, to be sure, but also in other ways including those specified by some special regulatory enactments. In regard to all these the workers exercise the legal and economic prerogatives flowing from their threefold capacity as owners, producers and beneficiaries of a portion of the national wealth.

MARILENA ULIESCU: Every worker's threefold capacity as owner, producer and beneficiary of the production means and the other property applies not only when the workers are viewed as members of society and accordingly on the macroeconomic level but also when regarded as members of the collective of the unit for which they are working. Instead of a general formulation, I think the capacity of owner is now becoming more clear and specific as an essential feature of the revolutionary nature of the changes that have been made in socialist ownership relations. Of course these new prerogatives of the workers' must also be considered in connection with the opportunity, provided by law, for every worker to own a part of the value of the production means belonging to the socialist unit for which he works, as a social share, for his cash contribution to its development fund.

I think the revolutionary nature of the RCP's new conception of improvement upon socialist ownership calls for reexamination of some old legal concepts in order to reflect and provide for their extensive application to the new facts and needs of political, economic and social development. Under the new conditions I do not believe we can or should go on using the theoretical concepts and constructions formed in the period when the legal conception of socialist ownership was based on recognition of the state's role as owner of property that actually belongs to the entire people. Without fundamental reconsideration of all aspects and elements of the legal conception of the entire people's socialist ownership, including the legal nature of the economic units' recognized right to the property entrusted to it for management and exploitation, we can not go beyond the stage, legally at least, of mere terminological changes, just as we cannot completely bring out the profoundly original features of the Romanian conception of the entire people's socialist ownership.

I do not think the exclusive nature of the entire people's right of ownership can be any obstacle to recognition of a right of the state socialist unit to ownership of the property entrusted to it so that it can perform a socially useful activity. I feel that if we fear the consequences of such recognition on grounds of impairing the practical usefulness of the entire people's right of ownership we are overlooking the dialectical relationship between the entire people and the workers collectives that compose it as well as the fact that the terms and limits of every workers collective's right of ownership of the property in the unit's inventory are legally set through the intermediary of the competent state organs and accordingly by the entire people's will. I am not inclined to believe that recognition of the state socialist unit's right of ownership of entrusted property in the entire people's social ownership is any dismemberment of the latter or any violation of its exclusive or absolute character. It is not a question of creating rights that will fragment the single national property by impairing or diminishing the entire people's right of ownership in some way, but of the very way the national wealth exists, that is the fact that the property composing it is entrusted according to law to the workers collectives for its management, exploitation, maintenance and development. The entire people's right of social ownership is not and cannot be identical with that of the workers collectives to which portions of the national wealth are entrusted.

From this standpoint I think that excessive legalizing of the entire people's right of ownership should be avoided in analyzing the characteristics and content of that institution. The entire people are an abstract entity, and exercise of the prerogatives of their right of ownership always requires state organs and organizations entrusted with the property corresponding to the purpose for which they were founded. And finally these units act in the name and on behalf of all society, as each workers collective manages a part of the national wealth in the name of the entire people.

Accordingly the state socialist units' right of ownership is, to a certain extent and in certain respects, "other" than the entire people's right of ownership. It is neither an overlapping nor a dismemberment of the latter but its concrete expression and the very way it exists. Reflecting the new manifestations of workers democracy in Romania, Law No 3 of 1982 (Article 3) provides that the workers in the state units may own parts of the value of those units' fixed assets as social shares. As we know, each worker's social share is formed by depositing a sum of money in the unit's economic development fund.

And so, according to the legal regulations, there is also a right of personal ownership of property in the state socialist unit's inventory, clearly from the standpoint of value alone. Then why should the state economic units be denied a right of ownership of the property entrusted to them for use on behalf of society as a whole?

CORNEL BIRSAN: The problem raised by Marilena Uliescu is important and answers an essential question, namely what is the economic units' legal position* regarding the property (production means) entrusted to them? In other words, do these units hold a right of ownership of the production means, and if so how are they legally regulated? The questions can be multiplied, because there are many legal as well as economic implications of the change of the holder of the entire people's right of ownership, and every one of them requires a solution (legislative, economic-financial etc.)

*(in the first place)

I agree that neither the entire people nor the state can exercise the attributes conferred by the right of ownership, which are exercised directly by the workers as owners, producers and beneficiaries of the material and cultural values, who are organized in collectives entrusted with a certain portion of the single reserve of socialist property belonging to the entire people in order to exploit and accordingly to administer, manage and develop that property. The latter is entrusted by the socialist state as general administrator of the entire people's property, providing for implementation of the national socioeconomic development policy and control over the use and management of the property entrusted to the workers collectives in the state socialist units. The pledge-contract is the legal instrument whereby the property is entrusted. According to Law No 3 of 1983 on the Pledge-Contract Between the State and the Workers Collectives in Enterprises and Centrals, the property of those units (an integral part of the entire people's property) is entrusted to the working personnel for direct exercise of the prerogatives and responsibilities flowing from the workers' capacity as owners, producers and beneficiaries. But I do not believe this allocation is carried out by creating a right of ownership of the entrusted property, a right that would belong to the socialist units, but by creating a right of direct administration or a right to administer, manage and develop that is revocable for all, so to speak, that is a right to be observed by all the other subjects of it but irrevocable for the state, which established it as general administrator of the entire people's property.

TEOFIL POP: I agree that the economic unit cannot have a right of ownership of the property it administers. The text of no law permits such a conclusion. Of course the workers collectives and each worker exercise their prerogatives as owners of this property, especially the production means.

It is a well-known fact that the people's right of ownership belongs to the entire community, because the production means and the products are appropriated in common, in the course of social relations, while the attributes of possession, use and disposition (the three essential attributes of ownership) are exercised via the people's power and in the people's own interest. Since the right of ownership involves an appropriation in one's own interest and since it was done by the entire people, I think it is impossible for the state socialist unit to make another appropriation of the same property, also in the capacity of owner. The fact that the property in the state socialist unit's inventory is an integral part of the entire people's property makes it impossible for the unit to own it too. Moreover if a right of the state socialist unit to ownership of the property in its inventory were recognized, I believe it would affect the unity and indivisibility of the entire people's right of ownership, which would be pulverized in the multitude of socialist units and appear as a mere fiction, despite the fact that the relations between the entire people, represented by the state, and the state socialist units can in no way impair the indivisibility, unity and inalienability of the entire people's ownership as reflections of their capacity as bearers of the nation's sovereignty and owners of the production means.

If it were acknowledged that two rights of ownership of the property entrusted to the state socialist units are exercised, both that of the entire people and that of those units, we would have a divided right of ownership in the form of coexistence of two rights of ownership of the same property. It is well known

that the right of ownership necessarily entails the right of disposition, while according to law the fixed assets in the state units' inventories are transferred to other state units without payment by the action of the supervisory organ without needing the respective unit's consent. I believe this is one of the essential differences between the state units' real right to the fixed assets and the real right (unquestionably one of ownership) of the cooperative units to the same assets, which can be alienated only for payment and only with the approval or confirmation of the cooperative's general assembly. The essential difference in the legal regulation of this real right is then clearly indicated by the fact that the state units have no "right of ownership" of their fixed assets because they have no right of disposition of them whatever, although they are of the greatest importance and value in their inventories. Only their supervisory organs are competent to "transfer" the state socialist unit's real right to this property to another unit, and they can entrust these resources to other units without payment and with no preliminary or subsequent notice, even consultative, to the unit's collective management organs.

Note that the new economic legislation (Law No 3 of 1982 on Contribution of Social Shares by Workers in State Economic Units to the Formation of the Economic Development Fund, Law No 2 of 1983 on the Basic Principles of Improvement of the System for Wages and Distribution of Workers' Incomes, and Law No 3 of 1983 on the Pledge-Contract) stipulates that the property in the state socialist units' inventories belongs to the entire people and is entrusted to those units for administration, and I do not think the respective regulations would have been necessary if the unit had been the holder of any right of ownership of the property.

In conclusion to the foregoing, I think the state socialist units still have only a right of direct administration of the property in their inventories, with the same legal content as before the ratification of the said laws but with a richer socioeconomic content defined in terms of the workers' threefold capacity as owners, producers and beneficiaries of all of society's material and cultural values.

CORNEL BIRSAN: In addition to that right, the workers also have a right of incorporeal ownership, legally speaking, of the social shares they contribute to the respective unit's economic development fund. The fact must not be overlooked that this contribution of social shares strengthens the workers' awareness as owners, producers and beneficiaries and more closely combines, against the background of workers self-management, the personal with the general interests pertaining to development of Romanian society as a whole, while heightening the sense of responsibility for the way the national wealth is managed and administered.

In my opinion the improvements made in ownership relations and in some legal concepts and economic categories have produced new characteristics in the use of the various levers of Romanian socialist democracy on the level of the economic units. Chief among these is the workers' more extensive and effective exercise of their right to manage production activity in the units they work for. Their greater responsibility along with their stronger feeling that they are the true owners of the national wealth has not only economic effects (better economic effectiveness, labor productivity and product quality, conservation of raw materials, fuels, energy etc.) but also social and ethical ones, bringing about

a new attitude toward work and social obligations flowing from the workers' capacity as owners, producers and beneficiaries of a portion of the national wealth.

MARIN TRAISTARU: In this new context all the political, economic, moral and philosophical values peculiar to the workers revolutionary democracy are asserted, integrated and generalized in all members of society through the implementation and efficient operation of the original and unique system of the socialist democracy established in Romania. This permits such characteristic traits of the working class as a consistent and staunch revolutionary spirit, a high standard of organization, order and discipline, mobilizing ability, a wealth of experience acquired in social management, a sense of responsibility in promoting the new, etc. to be impressed upon the actions and behavior of all members of Romanian socialist society. In the course of improvement of ownership relations, the working-class moral-political traits are becoming more and more characteristic of all Romanian society.

In its turn, this dialectical, equalized transfer of the values making up the cultural profile of the working class is taking effect upon the evolution of the socialist political institutions and system and their development in the essential direction of their increasingly complete integration in social activity, enabling the political strategy and activity to reflect the stage of social development and the objective requirements of social development and progress.

In this favorable climate the improved ownership relations are affecting the whole series of social relations, the division of labor, the exchange of activities, scientific organization of production and labor, and development of the material and moral incentives to work through generalization of the overall contract system in all activities, application of the new economic mechanism, and extensive promotion of workers self-management, which can equalize working and living conditions and distribution in industry and agriculture. Improvement of ownership relations is subordinated to the requirements for asserting a new regulatory and value system of labor, designed to enhance productivity, efficiency, profitability and product quality through promotion of self-management and economic self-administration, generalization of the overall contract system in all activities, and pursuit of an active democratic life. A broad democratic system for management of all units has been created in industry and in agriculture as well. Now it is necessary, as the RCP keeps pointing out, to secure the efficient operation of this system and to increase the responsibility of the general assemblies as democratic collective management organs for all activities in both the state and cooperative units. If these requirements are carried out in practice they can make every worker and cooperative member realize that he is an owner, producer and beneficiary and that it is his duty to participate with all responsibility in fulfillment of all production tasks and in management of the whole activity.

The conception of the RCP and its secretary general clearly reflects the principle, borne out by social experience, that we cannot say we have achieved the fully developed socialist society from both the material and cultural viewpoints of the new man's awareness until we reach the point where every Romanian citizen feels his responsibility both to himself and to the people and society and every one understands his rights and obligations and works with every conviction for the development of the Romanian system.

IOAN CETERCHI: As it was to be expected, the subject ERA SOCIALISTA proposed for discussion went beyond the scope of one social science such as the legal one. Although the legal implications of the concept of the right of socialist ownership of property belonging to the entire people are rather evident, the economic category of socialist ownership and the political, social and moral significance of the workers' status as owners, producers and beneficiaries of the national wealth cannot be ignored either. On the contrary, they are all inherently interdependent, forming a uniform picture of the entire people's socialist property and of the legal regulation of the property that composes it, and also of the workers' rights and responsibilities in the production process and in the management of the economic units.

Some differing opinions appeared in the discussions, which is natural for any discussion. Certainly some of the views should be scrutinized further, taken up from another perspective, correlated with other theoretical procedures and, what is more important, compared with their specific economic, legal and other effects. I think the discussion has served its purpose in that respect. Of course there are also points which we must clarify further. Experience itself and economic practice will tell us whether other theoretical procedures are not also necessary. The workers' threefold capacity as owners, producers and beneficiaries is no abstract idea but on the contrary, it has a concrete meaning and many economic, social-political and legal implications. It will take direct forms in economic practice and it will be improved as social, production and ownership relations are improved. In accordance with this capacity the workers are gaining and freely exercising a number of prerogatives without restriction. I think the essential ones among them are participation in decision-making on the level of the units and on that of the national, widely representative forums as well, and the exercise of self-management. Perhaps we should have discussed those points further. I think resumption of the subject that I took up, from the standpoint of self-management, would be a useful procedure. It would suggest new ways of analyzing the improvement of society and would bring out the value of the new and original measures developed and substantiated by the RCP and its secretary general for the further democratization of society and improvement of relations among the state, society and the citizen.

5186

CSO: 2700/259

BRIEFS

SOVIET TIES--Bucharest, 16 Oct (AGERPRES)--During a press conference organized in Bucharest, Academician A.M. Prokhorov, Nobel Prize laureate for physics, a member of the Presidium of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, director of the General Physics Institute, now in Romania to attend the 10th edition of the TIB [Bucharest International Fair], highlighted the positive results of the Romanian-Soviet collaboration in science and technology, a collaboration that for the Romanian side is coordinated by the National Council for Science and Technology headed by Academician Elena Ceausescu, D.Eng, first deputy prime minister of Romania, chairwoman of the council. Stressed was the cooperation between the relevant institutes in Romania and the Soviet Union in point of fundamental and applied research, as well as the fruitful results achieved in the development of various lasers and laser installations of world standard, and in the expansion of their application. [Text] [Bucharest AGERPRES in English 0937 GMT 16 Oct 84]

UNESCO EDUCATION SESSION OPENS--Bucharest, 15 Oct (AGERPRES)--The twelfth session of the Advisory Committee of the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Learning--CEPES--of Bucharest started in Romania's capital on Monday, October 15. The session will debate this and next year's activities of the CEPES as well as its plan of action until 1987. [Text] [Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1930 GMT 15 Oct 84 AU]

GREEK PEACE MOVEMENT DELEGATION--Bucharest, 15 Oct (AGERPRES)--A delegation of the Movement for National Independence, World Peace and Disarmament (KEADEA) of Greece, made up of Prof. George Dolianitis [spelling as received] and George Vasos [spelling as received], D.Sc., counsellor in the Ministry of Education, leading members of the movement, paid a visit to Romania upon the invitation of the National Peace Committee. The guests had interviews at the headquarters of the Peace National Committee, the Ministry of Education and Instruction, the headquarters of the Romanian League of Friendship With Peoples of Asia and Africa, and of the Cluj Socialist Democracy and Unity Organization. They saw round economic units and sociocultural establishments in Bucharest and Cluj-Napoca. [Excerpt] [Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1850 GMT 15 Oct 84 AU]

ZHAO ENLAI EXHIBITION--Bucharest, 12 Oct (AGERPRES)--The exhibition "Zhou Enlai's Life," arranged by the Museum of the Communist Party's History, of the revolutionary and democratic movement of Romania in cooperation with China's Museum of the Chinese Revolution and with China's Embassy in Bucharest, opened on Friday, October 12, at the Bucharest Museum, to mark the 35th anniversary of the

proclamation of People's China. The exhibition displays a great number of photographs, maps, texts and charts, which depict aspects of Zhou Enlai's life and activity, outstanding leader of the Chinese Communist Party and of the People's Republic of China, his merits in the organization of Chinese people's struggle for the establishment of the people's power, for the country's socialist development, his contribution to the elaboration and implementation of new China's foreign policy. Ion Ardeleanu, deputy director of the host museum, and Li Zewang, People's China ambassador in Bucharest, highlighted in their addresses the fine relations between the two parties, countries and peoples, stressing the decisive role of summit meetings, talks and understandings. [Text] [Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1913 GMT 12 Oct 84]

WOMEN'S COUNCIL PLENUM--Bucharest, 12 Oct (AGERPRES)--The National Women Council met in plenum on Friday, October 12, to debate the draft directives of the 13th RCP Congress and fully approved the provisions in the document as well as the tasks incumbent on the Women Council, women committees and commissions in the light of this document. The participants expressed, in behalf of all Romanian women, whatever their nationality, full approval of the RCP Central Committee resolution regarding Nicolae Ceausescu's reelection to the high office of general secretary of the party at the forthcoming forum of Romanian Communists. The plenary meeting called on Romania women to work unswervingly to carry out the RCP's and Romanian state home and foreign policies and to make their contribution to the implementation of the country's development plans. At the close of the plenary meeting, the participants addressed a telegram to President Nicolae Ceausescu. [Text] [Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1908 GMT 12 Oct 84]

ROMANIAN-SOVIET YOUTH MEETING--Moscow, 8 Oct (AGERPRES)--Events within the friendly meeting between youth representatives of Romania and the Soviet Union began in Moscow, an action devoted to the development and deepening of the relations of friendship and cooperation between the Union of the Communist Youth (UCY) and the Leninist Young Communist League (LYCL), between young people in the two countries. A youth delegation of Romania led by Dinu Dragan, secretary of the Central Committee of the UCY, attended. The events within the friendly meeting will be an occasion to exchange views and experience on the concerns and ways of action of the UCY and LTCL in the communist education through work and for work of the youth, for an increased contribution of the young generation to the ample process of building socialism and communism in the two countries. Part of the meeting, which is a working meeting, are a string of political, cultural, educational, and artistic actions, to contribute to a better mutual acquaintance between the youth in the two countries. [Excerpts] [Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1808 GMT 8 Oct 84 AU]

ISRAEL'S PERES THANKS DASCALESCU--Constantin Dascalescu, prime minister of the Government of the SR of Romania, received a telegram from Shimon Peres, prime minister of the State of Israel, who thanks him for congratulations on his appointment as Israel's premier. The telegram expressed the conviction that the good relations of cooperation between Romania and Israel will continue to develop to the benefit of the two peoples. [Text] [Bucharest SCINTEIA in Romanian 9 Oct 84 p 3]

POZDERAC INTERVIEW ON UNITY, RESPONSIBILITY

AU171641 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 13/14 Oct 84 pp 1, 3

[Interview given by Hamdija Pozderac, member of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, to Ivan Torov and BORBA journalists--during visit to BORBA editorial office "a few days ago"]

[Excerpts] [Pozderac] Several debates on the political and social-economic situation in the entire country that were held at the LCY Central Committee Presidium which preceded the 13th session of the LCY Central Committee and the decision to enter the public debate were aimed at coming to the LCY Central Committee plenum with as much concord as possible about problems in society and the LC. Many questions from previous debates have remained insufficiently coordinated in the leaderships and one is forced to conclude from all this that one should first discuss the situation in the LC, that is to say, the way it realizes its leading role in the present phase of the revolution in order to subsequently discuss relations in the federation, among republics, provinces, and federal institutions. Apart from this, during the summer we talked about indebtedness toward foreign countries and we will include that for the next session of the LCY Central Committee on 16 October. We will soon open the debate on the relations of the developed and undeveloped regions from the standpoint of the Stabilization Program, and then on relations in the sphere of ideology, culture, science. I am sure that all these discussions will also intensify the debate on those issues on which there is no complete concordance in the LCY leaderships, which will also enable the strengthening of unity at the grassroots and of society in the widest sense of the word.

[Torov] It seems that the dialogue and contact of the LC with the membership was difficult to establish and therefore there were numerous consequences: the weakening of the leading role of the LCY, loss of confidence, prevalence of partial interests....

[Pozderac] I should first say that we are a unique society in the world, one that is building socialism on the basis of self-management, the pluralism of self-managing interests, and the direct and free expression of the diversity of interests through which joint policy is built. Such expression of interests is undoubtedly one of the most significant achievements in the development of our revolution. However, through one-sidedly oriented practice,

this has resulted in all interests seeking the space [prostor] for legalization and legitimization in the LC, in their identification with the LCY, and not mostly in the institutions of the system that were intended for that function. Since the LC is a social instance able to offer the highest degree of legalization and legitimization to every interest, it was on that basis that the process of an a priori and unrestricted identification by the LC as a whole with certain social manifestations went on, especially by some parts of the LC, and even more so by parts of the leadership.

It is exactly for these reasons that every different interest aims to be realised at any cost, irrespective of all consequences that its imperative realization incurs. It is just because parts of the LC, even parts of the LC leaderships, are behind these interests, that one should energetically struggle against an--as a rule--negative politization of interests along the line of their noncritical, a priori, and absolute realization.

[Torov] Many discussions, and the current public debate as well, point out that our main stumbling block is the fact that there is no sufficient unity at the top in the leaderships.

[Pozderac] The question is posed on how to obtain unity at the top, how to unite specific people who come from republics and provinces in which different relations are differently manifested in many spheres. We are all expressions of certain environments, expressions of certain interests that should be coordinated and harmonized in a common interest. There is no conductors' baton here, we are all conductors together. The question now is to what extent we abandon partial interests and comprehend the historical dimension in social processes and relations. We must look for more of the things that link us and that unite us, which means Yugoslav socialist togetherness.

The unity in the LC, and at the top, in its highest organs, can be built only through unity at the grassroots. In this way I do not want to underestimate and belittle the need for unity from the top to the bottom, but I want to say: There is no unity at the top and there will be none on these principles of organizing your Yugoslav community unless it is built from the grassroots and through the communal leaderships, central and provincial committees up to the LCY Central Committee.

[Torov] One of the most energetic requests of the party rank and file in their insistence on concrete personal responsibility. Some moves recently have been encouraging, but they are nevertheless only an exception. How do you comment on this?

[Pozderac] Irresponsibility in the implementation of the agreed policy is to a certain extent characteristic both for the LC as a whole and for its parts, as well as for the leaderships. The executive function in the LC has not been worked out comprehensively yet, and what has been worked out does not work sufficiently. The executive political bodies of the central and provincial committees are constituted rather as political bodies and less as executive ones, and sometimes the political organs of the central committees assume the prerogatives of the central committees. The executive and monitoring of

policy is in the background, but we know that it is only through a continuous monitoring of the implementation of a policy that the manifestations opposed to it and their perpetrators can be identified. Since this identification is not carried out systematically, but in a secondary or campaign-like manner, there is no responsibility, and the whole matter is reduced to our saying that we are responsible (but not all, and certainly not all equally), and nobody can be singled out in this way.

AU171733

[Excerpts] This is why we have to develop responsibility as a class element of the entire policy that serves the realization of revolution. For, every social movement that practiced "witch hunts" lost the initiative in the end and finally lost the war as well. It starts being preoccupied with itself and not by processes, deals with its own situation, and then finds itself at a dead-end track, while other forces carry out policy and impose themselves as social arbiters. Emphasizing this class function, however, by no means excludes identification of individuals as perpetrators of certain mistakes and the application of appropriate sanctions to them. It goes without saying that this is so, but not in the way that is frequently being suggested.

However, this is not the right way out, because nothing is changed by changing individual people if the conditions that made their behavior possible remain. What should be changed are relations. Whenever the LC tackles the essential questions in the right way, the question of individual and collective responsibility, which includes dismissing, replacing, deprofessionalizing [deprofesionalizacija], and rejuvenating cadres, is being solved automatically. We already have all these principles; they only need to be implemented. We lack not ideas, principles, conclusions, but their complete and efficacious realization.

[Torov] On the eve of the party debate, at its beginning, and now that it is in full swing, warnings were and are issued--rather prematurely, in our opinion--that one should beware of and combat any carping. Does it not seem to you that the exaggerated fear of carpers is somehow turning into a barrier against any justified and properly argued criticism? Is this not an attempt to prevent a frank democratic dialogue?

[Pozderac] A critical attitude toward our reality must be expressed; all the omissions and shortcomings must be subjected to criticism so as to obtain a fuller and realistic picture of our overall situation, and to find on this basis the proper solutions for the future. However, the attempt a priori to call any criticism carping and thus to stop any critical thinking is not at all harmless. Here I do not mean criticism which comes from beyond the ideology of the LC and of self-management, from a conditionally speaking [uslovno] "left" or "right" side. But many of the things that are being nervously and rashly classified under "oppositionism," as radical as they may appear, describe our true situation, which we must change if we want to strengthen the course of the socialist revolution.

However, the conservative forces from statist and bureaucratic-technocratic structures that have unreservedly identified themselves with the status quo

a priori proclaim every criticism to be carping. Many people have become too sensitive. I usually say that we have become sensitive to criticism like a donkey to beating. The more he is hit, the lazier he becomes. There is no need to start a campaign, but we can achieve greater improvements in the overall atmosphere in society, in relations, and in people through public criticism, discussion, and the identification of occurrences and their protagonists, based on the values and truths of our revolution.

A few days ago, at a session of the Presidium of the Federal Committee of the Veterans Federation, I felt as if I were in the dock. And I can tell you that this is good. Criticism has begun to be pointed toward the top. This is the way to make even the top change more quickly in its relations toward phenomena that occur in the society and to make it more responsible, both for what has happened and for what should be done so that certain things may not happen.

[Torov] Comrade Pozderac, requests have been made in the public discussion that an extraordinary party congress be held, and the reasons that are cited are some of our grave problems: the economic crisis, nonimplementation of the Stabilization Program, the division of the workers class of Yugoslavia, nationalism, excessive debts, a million unemployed, and the Kosovo events. To what extent, in your opinion, are these requests realistic and justified?

[Pozderac] They arise chiefly as an expression of dissatisfaction because the agreements and positions of the 12th LCY Congress are not being implemented or are not fully being implemented. Therefore, if the aim of an extraordinary party congress were to agree, as the 12th LCY Congress did, that matters in society should develop on self-managing relations, with the LC in the leading role, such as extraordinary session of the highest party organ is really not necessary. What is needed is that we realize what we agreed upon at the 12th LCY Congress.

Negative manifestation of a stratification of society particularly intensified recently. There is enrichment without work and a stratification of society. We must not run away from these facts. Tremendous anomalies have arisen in society as regards the attitude toward social property. There has never been so much stealing of social property as there is now. The difficulties in employment are great, we have a million people at the unemployment bureau and abroad. In such a situation we have many omissions which we must call by their proper name. But I am not one of those who on the basis of these omissions and anomalies draw far-reaching conclusions to the effect that the dictatorship of the proletariat is degenerating, that the revolution is endangered, that its basic course is being abandoned.

AU171953

[Excerpts] If we do not solve this on self-managing foundations, the way we have agreed upon in the federal Yugoslav community, it means that another way of solving these problems is being advocated. Here there are several possibilities: that the state should solve these matters from statist-bureaucratic

positions; other ways to solve these matters, much more grave for socialist self-management, are also not unknown.

[Torov] The rank and file in associated labor has joined in a body the general party debate, as we see. However, the impression is that higher party organs, who should set an example to the rank and file, have not joined in the discussion with the same dynamic spirit, with criticism and a self-critical assessment of their work and "contribution" to the unsatisfactory situation in the LCY and society.

[Pozderac] The LCY Central Committee Presidium has decided to discuss its situation in connection with the draft conclusions of the 13th LCY Central Committee session. The same has been decided by the central and provincial committees and the LCY Central Committee: that we will devote a special session to this, perhaps when we sum up the experiences of the public discussion.

The Central Committee did not open the public debate only in order to get the support of the rank and file, or in order to have them decide for or against the conclusions, but in order to carry out a discussion on the proper questions of the implementation of our revolution and in order that the tasks for the coming period may be set on these questions. Otherwise, as regards some organs and organizations, there are plenty and even too many of those who would love the situation to be such that they could say to communal and basic organizations: Agree with the conclusions, embrace them with both arms, give us a big applause, do not hit at us and we will not hit at you.... I have the impression that something of this kind is happening in some communities. We do not need such a discussion. What we need is a proper, correct, class criticism of the situation and of the relations, on which we can then build and improve our society along the lines of the basic principles of the Constitution and the Associated Labor Law and the tasks of the Long-Term Economic Stabilization Program.

[Torov] Don't you think, Comrade Pozderac, that in some discussions we react rather clumsily to the enemies, that we multiply them, exaggerate them, and create an impression as if we were surrounded by them?

[Pozderac] As wise as it is not to overestimate the danger of enemies, it is also wise not to underestimate it. This is the alpha and omega in politics. However, when opponent forces from the "left" and "right" are involved, I have a feeling that we do not discuss them and their theses but, on the occasion of their texts, we open a debate among ourselves. Instead of speaking about the concepts, ideas, preoccupations of certain people, we are attaching labels to one another: This one is a liberal, that one a unitarian or a hardliner. I do not know in which group they include me, but I do know that we are being divided.

It would be good--and this is what I have tried to do--to search in the texts of these, conditionally speaking [uslovno receno], "opponents" of ours, for something that could be either a theoretical or a practical idea, a novelty, a project that would be worth using in social practice. I did work rather hard when persuing them, but without any real result. An unnecessary show was also made about other texts that are, to put it simply, failures,

regardless of their being qualified as; allegedly, great works. They certainly have some, but completely marginal values, all until they cross over to the sphere of bare political ambition.

We have started overcoming this, not letting ourselves be taken in by usually well-calculated offenses and creations. However, we manage to do this for a month, and then what has been stopped starts again, even to the tunes we ourselves already know by heart. Such a temporary relation does not solve the problem.

[Torov] Could you comment on the situation created about the "White Book"?

[Pozderac] The fuss was made about the "White Book" not for any essential reasons, but merely because of the occasion of the book. Had there been any essential reasons, a debate would have opened, one would have been able to see which assessments had been acceptable and which unacceptable, what the appearance of the book really meant, and everything would not have been reduced to anathematizing this or that assessment. The debate began with an occasion and arrived at an anathema, and when it comes to that, the weaker side always has the worse time.

CSO: 2800/46

MARKOVIC ADDRESSES COOPERATION ANNIVERSARY MEETING

AUI31841 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 11 Oct 84 p 3

[V.R. report]

[Excerpts] Azanja, 10 Oct--The agricultural cooperative movement in Serbia festively celebrated its 90th anniversary today. The host of this important celebration was the agricultural cooperative in the Sumadija village of Azanja [Serbia], which was formed 90 years ago and whose birth marked the beginning of the agricultural cooperative movement in Serbia.

Dragosla Markovic, member of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, spoke at a festive session on the development of the cooperative movement in Serbia and present circumstances in the countryside and agriculture.

The production of food and agriculture are among the priorities of our economic policy. The long-term program of economic stabilization, Markovic said, is explicit in this respect: If we want to exploit all the great potentials and possibilities for the further advancement of agricultural production, if we want to become significant food producers and to satisfy our requirements, ensure the necessary reserves, and become serious exporters of agricultural produce, we must make new steps, essential moves, and quality changes in the field of agrarian policy and the development of socio-economic self-managing relations in the countryside, and in agriculture as a whole.

Dragoslav Markovic particularly stressed that the processes of socialization must run more quickly if we want to realize our ambitious programs of increasing food production as one of the basic premises in the long-term program of economic stabilization.

It is obvious that to a considerable extent we have used up the reserves in the present way of doing things, and that radical moves are necessary to open up a fresh scope for socializing labor and resources, and thus new qualities in the association of agriculturists. To develop the role of the cooperative in production is the first class task of the cooperative organizations and the cooperative movement as a whole. This is a chance for, and a challenger to cooperative workers, experts, and especially agriculturists.

The cooperatives and similar forms of organizing agriculturists will undergo their test in the coming period on this question as regards their contribution to economic stabilization, Dragoslav Markovic, member of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, said in conclusion.

CSO: 2800/41

SERBIAN SAWP COMMITTEE DISCUSSES ECUMENISM

LD172053 Bel grade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1545 GMT 16 Oct 84

[Text] Belgrade, 16 Oct (TANJUG)--As a movement that draws believers and religious communities closer together, ecumenism enjoys the full support of the Socialist Alliance and all socio-political factors. However, the movement's potential can make an even greater contribution to religious community and tolerance, thereby also strengthening our society's fundamental values.

This is the main conclusion from today's discussion on ecumenical movements in our country held at a session of the Serbian SAWP republican conference coordination committee for religious communities. The introductory report by Dragan Novakovic, adviser to the Serbian Executive Council commission for religious questions, and the discussion, in which priests from several religious communities took part, estimated that relations between the religious communities are basically satisfactory, despite certain open questions and mutual problems. If there are problems between the churches, it can be noted that relations between believers are good. Believers and priests maintain instant cooperation and contacts, associate with each other, and are involved in the Socialist Alliance's joint actions. There are also quote a few examples of mutual aid in the construction of religious objects.

A true picture of ecumenism can be gained from relations between the two largest and most significant religious communities, the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church. These relations are basically at a satisfactory level, although burdened with negative experiences from the Second World War and problems connected with attempts by the current leadership of the Catholic Church to rehabilitate Cardinal Stepinac. These problems come to the fore in particular when one considers that the Serbian Orthodox Church has good relations with the Belgrade Archiepiscopate, as well as with the Ljubljana and Catholic Church in Slovenia as a whole.

A particular problem is the Serbian Orthodox Church's non-recognition of the autocephalous nature of the Macedonian Orthodox Church. This is explained by reasons of church law. On this subject the question was raised of how one can talk in general about an ecumenical community and ecumenism when no contribution is being made to understand a fraternal neighboring people

with which one lives within the same community. It is precisely in the spirit of ecumenism that this problem should be resolved, and good theologians maintain that "when good will exists the canons are no hindrance." In this case, however, it seems that the call for a decision to be adopted by an ecumenical council is only a pretext for postponing recognition, for it would be difficult to convene such a council during our lifetime because of the deep differences and disagreements.

There was quite a lot of discussion, and even polemics, on the topic of relations between the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Islamic community. As was stated, these relations were affected by the counterrevolutionary events in Kosovo. In the discussion the conviction represented by the majority of the Orthodox clergy and the church itself was expressed that the Islamic community and the Islamic Association in Kosovo had dissociated themselves quite formally from the demonstrations and were opportunistic in their attitude to attacks on religious objects and orthodox believers, as well as to the emigration of Serbs and Montenegrins from Kosovo. On the other hand it is emphasized that the demonstrations were criticized immediately, that no Imam or student at a religious school took part, and that the clergy there do not have very much influence over the young people who are indoctrinated with irredentism. Whatever the case, as was emphasized, the need for Islamic clergy to speak out more frequently and in public in criticism of the actions of the irredentists is even more pronounced, for it is clear that the opportunities for such action, which is both a religious and patriotic duty, are far from having been exhausted.

CSO: 2800/41

DAILY CRITICALLY REVIEWS USSR JOURNAL ARTICLE

AU121839 Belgrade POLITIKA in Serbo-Croatian 11 Oct 84 p 2

[Text] Moscow, 10 Oct--The October issue (No 10) of the known Soviet journal MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN carries under the rubric "From the History of International Relations" an article by N. Semenov entitled "For Scientific Objectivity" [in connection with the publication of a collection entitled "AVNOJ (the Antifascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia) and the Revolution." In his article the author sharply criticizes Slobodan Nesovic and Branko Petranovic, the compilers of this collection. This fact on its own would not evoke any special attention because it is the indisputable right of historians and critics to agree or disagree and to prove their views as best they can. However, there are elements in N. Semenov's very approach that deviate from this assumption of polemics. At the very beginning of his article, he asserts his exclusive thesis that the Yugoslav authors "have deliberately renounced the principle of scientific objectivity" and, what is even worse, he claims that they have done this to "blacken (no other word can be found for this) the policy of the Soviet Union toward the Yugoslav problems during World War II."

This is a big and, one can say, importunate conclusion which is unfortunately reminiscent of certain, luckily overcome, past times of such blanket appraisals. The next remark of Semenov in this connection is that the authors have deliberately abridged and selected their documents and quotations in order to achieve the aforementioned purpose. To tell the truth, it is precisely Semenov, who attributes this purpose to them to be able, on the basis of this claim used as his argument, to further prove all his theses and conclusions by a method that is not really scientific, but rather more politically suggestive.

Denial to the Right to Commentary

A news reporter cannot--nor is it his task--in this space to concern himself with a comparison of the documents involved, nor can he assume the right, as Semenov does, to explain the intentions of the authors. They will do it themselves if they consider it necessary to do so. But what may interest the readers of this issue of MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN is what Semenov in fact asserts by making his own selection from among the documents and quotations provided by the collection. First of all, he in fact disputes the right of the Yugoslav

authors to make conclusions because he completely disqualifies them at the start as "scientifically unobjective and tendentious" and he does so even before he even tries to prove this, something that may have a decisive effect on the insufficiently informed readers here who cannot obtain the aforementioned book.

The author does not stop at this statement, but also moves on "in breadth." He also claims in his article the following among other things: "It must be said that distortions of the USSR's attitude toward the Yugoslav national liberation struggle have found their way into Yugoslav publications in the past also and that the Soviet press has called attention to this fact in the past." One could think that Semenov addresses his blanket criticism generally to Yugoslav historians and their general approach to and appraisal of that important problem and period of history but he does not try to prove his view and instead only announces it in a superior manner.

Having established his framework in this way, he further develops his exclusive thesis that interests him and, as regards the book itself, it can be said that he uses it more as a motive and a crutch than anything else. First and foremost, disputing the objectivity of the selection of documents and quotations, he claims that, from the very first day of the war and the revolution of the Yugoslav peoples, the Soviet Union wholeheartedly, unreservedly, and without any interference supported that struggle and the policy of the Yugoslav Communist Party to the maximum extent possible. Citing a number of quotations and documents, he in fact develops and suggests the conclusion that without this support of the Soviet Union, especially in relation to the Western allies, the Yugoslav revolution would not have been as successful as it was. He is especially troubled by the sentence in the book which, according to his quotation, says that, "for the reasons of state, the Soviet Union slowed down the process of the revolutionary struggle of the national liberation movement...." Semenov says that Moscow immediately positively appraised the second AVNOJ session and that it "acted toward the National Committee of Liberation of Yugoslavia as toward an actual government...." For instance, he does not mention in any way that there were certain disagreements between the Yugoslav leadership and Stalin about convening the AVNOJ session. After all, these are proven historical facts and historians have established them long ago and therefore it should be left to them to answer this. He does not explain, for instance, how it happened that the Soviet military mission was the last to arrive at the supreme headquarters [of the Yugoslav National Liberation Army].

Defense of Comintern

Claiming that, as regards the Soviet Union's assistance to the Yugoslav revolution, everything was in the best of order from the beginning of the end of the war, Semenov also advocates the thesis about a "complete agreement between the Comintern and the Yugoslav leadership," so that the reader might think that this was nearly an ideal unity of views and decisions, something that is naturally disputed and there are enough documents proving the contrary situation. The author especially stresses "that it is not true that, following the policy of the Soviet Union, the Comintern gave the Yugoslav Communist Party incorrect recommendations regarding the strategy and

tactics of the party." In this connection it should be first established what is considered correct or incorrect by the author. He then simply concludes that, as regards the Comintern's policy, the compilers of the collection "used arbitrary commentaries and presented them as 'arguments.'"

The author energetically disputes the views of the Yugoslav writers that, "backed by the Soviet Government which did not wish to spoil its relations with the Western allies, the Comintern twice cut short the initiatives of the Yugoslav Communist Party in 1941 and 1942 for the formation of the general political antifascist organs and then, in the third attempt, set its limitations for the formation of these organs...."

Wishing to prove that everything was in order as regards the Comintern, Semenov selectively singles out some of the documents and quotations and cites some which rather more confirm than refute the views of the Yugoslav authors. He notes that, acting on behalf of the Comintern, Dimitrov requested that the name "shock brigades" be used instead of the name "proletarian brigades" and pointed out that this was an important political question, among other things, also because of reaction abroad. He notes that the Comintern requested that the National Committee of Liberation of Yugoslavia not present itself as a government, but as a political organ. He quotes Comintern's telegram: "Do not put this committee in any way up against the Yugoslav Government in London...." The same sources requested that the "slogans about the republic not be used," and so forth. Semenov is even angry because, as he has established, the authors of the collection failed to publish the second part of the quoted telegram of Dimitrov, the part which, transmitting the Comintern's views, says: "Take into account the fact that the Soviet Union has treaty relations with the Yugoslav king and government and any open action against them would provoke additional difficulties in the general war effort of and the mutual relations between the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States...." As we have said, the author of the MEZHODUNARODNAYA ZHIZN article himself cites this latter quotation. On the other hand, what sense at all does it make now to concern oneself with or even defend the correctness of the attitude and actions of the Comintern which has left so many unpleasant traces in the international workers movement and on which the history of this very movement has passed its judgment long ago and determined its place. And why then does Semenov do this? Is it only for a scientific historical need?

As we pointed out at the beginning, it must be left to the historians to determine the significance of documents and to provide their elucidations, as science only can do so, within the entire context of events and all known facts, even though there are already enough facts which have been indisputably proven. The struggle of views is never harmful provided that its participants recognize that each has the right to his views, judgments, and conclusions. What troubles the reader of the aforementioned article is the fact that the author mainly wishes to dictate and impose his own conclusions and for this reason disqualifies his interlocutors at the very beginning as "deliberately scientifically unobjective" and, as it follows from all that, as malicious. This kind of discussion can hardly be acceptable among equal interlocutors, but Semenov fails to take this into account. Another thing is also that, one

can say, he considers history "in segments" and that, therefore, one gains the impression that he is not at all interested in what happened before or after the period under consideration or in how the same Soviet leadership of that period spoke about the Yugoslav revolution only a few years after the war. If everything about which the author wishes to convince his readers in the aforementioned manner were true for the preceding period, then this would make it possible to also explain further developments differently. Fortunately, history has rejected, convincingly refuted, and condemned these things of explanation and replaced them with a mutually accepted truth on which the contemporary friendly and equal relations between the two countries are based.

CSO: 2800/46

BRIEFS

ALBANIA'S CHARGES--Belgrade, 11 Oct (TANJUG)--Yugoslavia continues to consider cooperation between itself and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania in the field of culture, as well as in other fields, on the principles of mutual respect and equality as essential. We are also convinced that, given a little good will on the Albanian side, it would be possible to agree to a program of bilateral cooperation in the fields of science and culture. This statement was made by spokesman of the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs Zeljko Jeglic at his regular weekly press conference here today. He was asked for his views on the charges by the Albanian News Agency, ATA, which claimed that Yugoslavia had sabotaged the recent cultural talks between the two countries. Jeglic said that the charges transmitted by the Albanian News Agency were incorrect and illogical and recalled that the greater part of the cultural cooperation program was agreed to in a business-like atmosphere during two rounds of talks in Belgrade. But the numerous proposals submitted by the Yugoslav delegation for cooperation in the field of culture, including those of direct interest to the Albanian nationality in Yugoslavia, were rejected by the Albanian side, he said. [Text] [Belgrade TANJUG in English 1637 GMT 11 Oct 84 LD]

BULGARIAN ARMY'S ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION--On the occasion of the jubilee 40th anniversary of the Bulgarian People's Army, a celebration was held in the Belgrade Army Hall yesterday which was attended by Lieutenant Colonel General Slavko Maricevic, assistant federal secretary for national defense, and a large number of officers of the Belgrade garrison. [Text] [Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 21 Sep 84 p 6 AU]

KNJIZEVNE NOVINE EDITOR--After a long pause, KNJIZEVNE NOVINE, organ of the Serbian Writers' Association, will again be published. Miodrag Perisic, literary critic from Belgrade, has been appointed chief and responsible editor, while the new editorial board will consist of Petar Cvetkovic (deputy editor), Branko Andjic, Sinan Gudzevic, Mihajlo Pantic, Borka Pavicevic, and Slobodan Zubanovic (secretary). The first issue of KNJIZEVNE NOVINE, which will appear, as we have been informed, on 15 October, is already being prepared. The issue will be devoted to the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the liberation of Belgrade, on 29 October, and to the October meeting of writers that will begin on 16 October 1984. [Text] [Belgrade POLITIKA in Serbo-Croatian 23 Sep 84 p 9 AU]

SERB OFFICIAL DIES--Belgrade, 9 Oct (TANJUG)--Dr Miodrag Visnjic, member of the Serb Executive Council and a prominent socio-political and scientific worker, died after a short illness in a Belgrade clinic yesterday. [Summary] [Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1051 GMT 9 Oct 84 LD]

TANJUG-TT COOPERATION--Titograd, 18 Oct (TANJUG)--Director of the Yugoslav News Agency TANJUG Mihailo Saranovic and General Manager of the Swedish News Agency TT Svent Gerentz have signed an agreement on cooperation between the two news agencies. The agreement envisages for information exchange and other forms of cooperation. Gerentz is today, Thursday, visiting the Yugoslav Republic of Montenegro where he has been received by Republican Presidency President Miodrag Vlahovic. During his visit to Yugoslavia, Gernetz has been received by Yugoslav Secretary for Information Mitko Calovski and Deputy Foreign Secretary Budimir Loncar. The talks between the ranking Yugoslav officials and the TT general manager encompassed the development of Yugoslav-Swedish cooperation both at the bilateral and the international level. [Text] [LD190401 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1736 GMT 18 Oct 84]

NEW PRESIDENT OF MACEDONIAN TV--Skopje: At the session of the council of the Confederation of Trade Unions of Macedonia, Vasko Kostojcinovski was elected president of this council. Vasko Tegovski was reelected secretary of the council. Aleksandar Donev, the hitherto president of the council of the Trade Union Confederation of Macedonia, was elected member of the council of the Confederation of the Trade Union of Yugoslavia. [Summary] [LD190401 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1347 GMT 18 Oct 84]

CSO: 2800/46

END